DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 624 EA 013 136

AUTHOR Watson, Leonard E., Ed.
TITLE Current Issues in the Management of Education. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the British Educational Administration Society (8th, Sheffield, England, September 1979). Sheffield Papers in Educational Management, No. 12.
INSTITUTION British Educational Administration Society.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 268p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cost Effectiveness; *Declining Enrollment; *Educational Administration; *Educational Assessment; Educational Demand; *Educational Finance; Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Educational Resources; Educational Supply; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; Evaluation Methods; Expenditures; Faculty; Foreign Countries; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Resource Allocation; School Closing; School Personnel; School Size
IDENTIFIERS England

ABSTRACT

This document presents edited versions of the keynote and seminar papers presented at the eighth annual conference of the British Educational Administration Society in 1979. The conference focused on the relation of educational management in England to three particular subjects: educational finance, enrollment decline, and the evaluation of educational institutions. The five papers relating to finance deal with school resources, particularly faculty; educational costs during economically trying times; secondary school costs; and the economics of small schools. The 13 papers devoted to enrollment decline discuss planning and policy formation, costs of decline, the availability of professional assistance, effects on employment of teachers, the impact of decline on labor relations and curriculum, and school closing. Another 13 papers deal with educational evaluation, considering such topics as educational audits, self-evaluation by schools, evaluation of management, competency-based evaluation, and the purposes, problems, and priorities of evaluation. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198624

Sheffield Papers in Education Management, No.12

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CURRENT ISSUES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION

Proceedings of the
Eighth Annual Conference
of the
British Educational Administration Society
Sheffield, September 1979

Edited for the Society
by
Leonard E Watson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D L. Parkes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sheffield City Polytechnic
Department of Education Management

for the

British Educational Administration Society

1980

EA 013 136

SHEFFIELD PAPERS IN EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

This series of Occasional Papers is produced by the Department of Education Management of Sheffield City Polytechnic. The following issues may be obtained at the prices indicated from the Department Secretary, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield.

1. Peter Newsam (Education Officer, Inner London Education Authority), The Consequences of Falling School Enrolments: an Education Officer's View. ISBN 0 903761 149. 50p post paid.

2. L.E. Watson (Sheffield City Polytechnic), The School and the Community. ISBN 0 903761 157. 40p post paid.

3. Rex Trippier (Head, St James' Junior and Infant School, Blackburn) Parents as a Resource in Primary Education: a Selected Annotated Bibliography. ISBN 0 903761 165. 60p post paid.

4. Dudley Fiske (Chief Education Officer, Manchester LEA), Falling Numbers in Secondary Schools: Problems and Possibilities. ISBN 0 903761 173. 35p post paid.

5. Rob Cuthbert (Further Education Staff College), The Relationship Between Planning and Budgeting in the Management of Polytechnics. ISBN 0 903761 181. 60p post paid.

6. George Tolley (Principal, Sheffield City Polytechnic), Participatory Management in Institutions of Higher Education. ISBN 0 903761 19X. 40p post paid.

7. A.W. Bacon (University of Sheffield), M.A. Redmond (The Open University) and A. Sellars (Sheffield LEA) (eds), Continuing Educational Opportunities for Adults. ISBN 0 903761 203. 95p post paid.

8. R.H. Mercer (Sheffield City Polytechnic) (ed), Recent Developments in Mature Student Access to Education in South Yorkshire. ISBN 0 903761 211. £1.00 post paid.

9. R.J.S. Baker (Sheffield City Polytechnic), Organisation and Management Theory: Some Perspectives. ISBN 0 903761 114. £1.50.

10. L.E. Watson (Sheffield City Polytechnic) (ed), Adult Education in Sheffield: A Survey of the Provision, Needs, Access and Information-Giving Methods for Adult Learners. ISBN 0 903761 122. £2.00 post paid.

11. R.E. Jennings (State University of New York at Buffalo), Corporateness and Education: Changing Power Relations in Local Government. ISBN 0 903761 130. £1.25 post paid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editor's Preface ix

Part I: Finance and the Management of Education

I.G. Cunningham, *Finance and the Management of Education* 1

Patrick Bailey, *School Resources and their Management: Teaching Staff, the Primary Resource* 11

John Fielden, *Educational Costing for Troubled Times* 17

B.A.A. Knight, *The Running Costs of an Individual School* 27

Tim Simkins, *The Economics of Small Schools: Some Conceptual Issues* 37

Part II: Management in the Light of Falling Enrolments

Keith McWilliams, *Management in the Light of Falling Enrolments: Changing Rolls and Roles* 49

D. Cracknell, *Falling Rolls and the Reappearance of Educational Planning: Planning for Changing School Rolls in Leeds* 63

John L. Davies, *Policy Formation to Cope With Conflict and Ambiguity: a U.S. Experience*. 71

David Falcon, *Planning Rural Primary Education in the Face of Falling Rolls* 81

T.M. Hinds, *The Rising Costs of Falling Rolls* . 83

Michael Matthews, *Falling Rolls, INSET and the Professional Centre* 89

Roger H. Mercer, *Declining Rolls: Some Management Issues in Secondary Schools* 97

Jennifer A. Mundy and Michael J. Elliott, *The Development of Consortia for 16+ Provision in the Face of Falling Enrolments* . . . 105

R. Stenning, *The Labour Relations Implications of Contraction in the Schools Education Service* 113

Harry Tomlinson, *Preserving the Curriculum as Rolls Fall* 125

Norman Whiting, *Some Aspects of Management Within the Closing School* 133

Dudley Wright, *Management and Motivation in a Contracting Secondary School System* . . 141

Mrs P.E. Young, *The Primary School Curriculum in a Contracting Situation* 151

Part III: The Evaluation of Educational Institutions

Eric Hoyle, *Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Educational Institutions* 159

John Calvert, *Relative Performance of Educational Institutions* 179

Mrs Elsa Davies, *The Development of Pupil-Involved Assessment and its Implications for the Future of Education* 185

W.F. Dennison, *The Education Audit as a Monitor of Institutional Effectiveness* 193

Mark W. Hewlett, *Evaluating Schools and Their Management: Developments in Solihull* . . 201

K. Lambert, *Evaluation at Great Barr School* . . 209

Geoffrey Lyons, *Self Evaluation for the Secondary School* 215

Lloyd E. McCleary and Iva D. McCleary, *Institutional Evaluation and Competency-Based Approaches to Institutional Change* . 223

B.J. McGettrick, *Assessment and Management in a College of Education* 231

J.M. Shepherd, *Evaluation of Secondary Schools: Problems and Purposes* 237

David Smetherham, *Knowing Schools: a Case in Point* 245

D.M. Smith, *The Evaluation of 'Work Area' Priorities in Secondary Schools* 257

M.A. Sterne, *'Objective' Measurements in the Evaluation of Schools by LEAs* 265

EDITOR'S PREFACE

The British Educational Administration Society has a membership open to individuals in the United Kingdom who are interested in promoting a fruitful relationship between practice, teaching and research in education management and administration. Its eighth Annual Conference was held in Sheffield City Polytechnic for two days in September 1979. On that occasion a new conference format was adopted, and this is reflected in the contents and organisation of this volume. Where in the past there typically had been about four main speakers, along with discussion groups, built around a single theme: in this case work was related to three themes. Each was introduced by a 'keynote' speaker:

I.G. Cunningham: Finance and the Management of Education.

Keith McWilliams: Management in the Light of Falling Enrolments.

Prof. Eric Hoyle: Evaluating the Effectiveness of Educational Institutions.

There followed seminar papers presented to participants by members of the Society, on topics related to the themes. Each seminar was presented twice, to different sets of participants.

This volume brings together edited forms of both 'keynote' and seminar papers.

I am grateful to the authors for the assistance they have given me in editing these papers, many of which had to be

reduced considerably in length to meet the space limits of this report.

FINANCE AND THE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION

FINANCE AND THE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION*

I.G. Cunningham

Education Officer
Association of County Councils

For a long time now we have been accustomed to the idea that finance is not only central to management of the public services, but is the key to their management. Is there a sense in which it has become a proxy for management?

There was a period when finance was regarded firmly as the hand-maiden and the accountant never got the privileges of the Directors' lunch-room. The picture began to change as units became larger, their management more sophisticated. The chief accountant became a Director (Finance) and a policy-maker. In periods of expansion however, the production chief - the sales director, chief scientist, works manager, or chief education officer - was likely to hold on to the central position. In periods of contraction the Treasurer would be more likely to move to the centre of the stage, cast unreasonably and all too often in a negative role as villain. What should be the positive role of financial management and how far is it achieved in the education service?

Education in England and Wales operates at three levels: nationally we rely largely on it for the skills needed to reduce the rate of decelleration/maintain/improve our economic position in the international community; at the middle level of the local education authority the connections are more obviously with social needs as well as local economic ones. The third level is that of the individual - in management terms, the level of the institution or the field worker. How does financial management impinge on the operation of the service at these three levels?

---

* The views expressed in this paper are personal and do not necessarily represent the views of the Association of County Councils.

At National Level

As every reader of the education press, and probably every rate-payer now knows, the main financial management tool of Government in the field of local authority spending lies in the Rate Support Grant and the system for its distribution. The current system (refined in the Local Government Act of 1974) has not worked well over the last few years, largely as a consequence of inflation, and restraint on the public sector. It should be seen within the total review process of government and public expenditure. At the top is the Public Expenditure Survey Committee which, under the direction of the Treasury, reviews public expenditure for a five-year period. The object is to determine growth rates overall and within individual departmental expenditure, and to aid the Treasury in deciding on the Public Sector Borrowing Requirement, the growth of the money supply, etc.

PESC reviews include information from Government departments on policy proposals, and at this stage the local authorities have a chance to provide information and comment through a structure adopted as a result of pressure a few years ago.

1. There are service groups comprising officials of the department concerned, and officers of local authorities and their associations. The groups have no policy function but forecast expenditure on services for the next financial year.

2. Information from the Forecasting Sub-Groups is then passed to an Expenditure Steering Group (with a similar composition). This Group considers policy implications, ideas for new policies and meets more regularly than its Forecasting Sub-Group. It is not, however, a policy-making group.

3. The Expenditure Steering Groups in their turn inform the Consultative Council on Local Government Finance (CCLGF), a body composed of Ministers, senior civil servants, elected members and local authority officers. The annual (autumnal) decision on the Rate Support Grant is determined after consultation with CCLPG.

4. Subordinate to CCLGF and feeding information to steering

groups and sub-groups is the Grants Working Group which considers alternative formulae for the distribution of the Rate Support Grant.

The work of the groups includes an annual updating of information on local government spending, which is used by the central government departments to back their 'bids' to the Public Expenditure Survey Committee. PESC outlines the expenditure plans of departments (and government) and gives details of the breakdown. This enables local authorities to see what sort of growth rates have been assumed for particular services over the next quinquennium, subject of course to changes in central government policy.

The Secretary of State for the Environment decides what percentage central government is prepared to pay in RSG of the 'relevant expenditure' as agreed by CCLGF (61% in the current year). The grant is a residual one, payable to authorities after specific and supplementary grants (apart from housing subsidies, rate rebate, and grants towards expenditure on mandatory student awards) have been deducted from the 16%. For example, for 1979/80:

	£m (at Nov. 1978 prices)
1. Estimated relevant expenditure	14,109
2. Aggregated Exchequer grant at 61%	8,607
3. Total of specific revenue and supplementary grants	1,349
4. Rate Support Grant (item 2 minus item 3)	7,258
5. Needs element	4,434
6. Resources element	2,137
7. Domestic element	687

RSG is non-specific, i.e. not allocated to particular services or needs, and the local authority Associations have for some time been defending the right of each authority to apply the money it receives to local priorities as it sees them.

At Local Level

Most local authority annual expenditure is the result of historic circumstances - maintaining its commitments to provide and run services - but the annual budgetary process enables elected members to review programmes and decide new policies. The process has five main functions:

1. to fix the rate of precept;
2. to assist policy-making;
3. to give authority to future expenditure;
4. to provide a base for the control of expenditure;
5. to provide a yardstick for measuring policy.

Budgeting starts almost immediately after the beginning of the previous financial year when overall targets may be set. Programmes will be planned within those limits to involve the maintenance of existing policies, and take account of new ones. At this point programme committees begin to have their say on priorities for expenditure, and the officers are responsible for demonstrating how far it is possible to implement policy within the targets set. As out-turn figures for the previous year become available the budgeting can become more accurate, but throughout it is subject to the slings and arrows of outrageous inflation, and to salary settlements.

In reaching their decisions, the politicians will have considered the national indicators and the Government's assessment of appropriate levels of expenditure by services, but in the end their decisions must reflect local needs, which may require growth patterns out of line with nationally predicted percentages. During the process of the budget exercise there is of course the problem of attempting to assess the authority's needs element receipt from RSG. In recent years this has fluctuated severely for some authorities (in spite of a 'damping' formula), and has meant for some a fresh start on the budget to contain rate increases within what is locally, and politically, thought to be reasonable.

Once the process is complete, the budget approved, and the new financial year has begun the authority's preoccupations turn to ensuring the proper control of its spending - which means saying

'yes' as well as 'no'. Systems vary widely and problems differ, but the education service in particular presents a special situation. It is large and it has many outlets. Control on spending at institutional level is therefore a key task for the service.

At Institutional Level

Some of the problems authorities face in budgeting (guessing the level of RSG, or inflation, or movements in population) are matched in the institution: and in education the difficulties are compounded by the difference between the financial and academic years. Plans must be based on assumptions, and not all decisions can wait until the budget is settled. There is here an inevitable conflict between the desirable development of autonomy and responsibility for decisions at institutional level, and the obvious gains to be made in some activities from more centralised control. For example, bulk-purchasing may provide goods of a given standard at less cost, but it may also mean that all have to accept a product which will be better than some require and worse than others would wish. Tight central control of budgets means less freedom to spend according to local perceptions of priorities. In times of financial strigency there are two opposite tendencies: the first is to take more power to control back to the centre where savings in one area can be directly allocated to needs in another; the second is to give full rein, but less than full resources, to the local autonomists and tell them to decide the priorities - in effect to pass at least some of the odium for difficult decisions down the line.

Authorities' estimates are normally informed by partial budgeting at institutional level, and more significantly by information from schools and colleges about staff and student requirements. The major allocations - of staffing and of capitation - can only finally be made to institutions after the Authority's budget is set, but that should normally allow enough time to prepare for the new academic year, whilst the summer term requirements will usually have been taken into account in the budget at previously agreed levels.

Does It Work?

How effective are the controls at the different levels? How far do they reflect the objectives or philosophies of those responsibile? The control of expenditure on education in LEAs has been likened to the control of a modern oil tanker. The vessel (the education service) is unusually large and, whilst minor alternations in course or speed can be achieved within short periods, radical alternations require more time. It is a handy analogy as one can build on it as one chooses. The cargo is prescious, the systems depend on up-to-date technologies, the investment in the whole is considerable, the number of societies which can afford one is limited, the load - when dispersed among smaller units - is no less valuable but becomes more manoeuvrable.... and so on. The education service, like the oil tanker, depends on its systems and its skilled crew. If it is to achieve its purpose, it must be subject to overall control (the national government level) from the design and planning stage, to the decisions on destination and course. Once launched the vessel is under the control of its crew (local authority and staff) and it is for them to make fine adjustments in the light of local needs. Nature has never been totally predictable; human nature no more so. Only a local crew with skill can spot and respond appropriately to unpredictable changes. Local authorities, working within either an overall plan or a general consensus about objectives, must be best placed to take these decisions through their staffs. Do their normal methods of financial management help them to achieve those ends?

Local authority spending has increased from 11% of the Gross National Product in 1949 to approximately 14% in 1974. (In different terms, approximately one-third of all spending on the public sector). The decisions about the size and shape of the vessel and about its course remain with the national government (the 1944 Education Act, the assumed share of expenditure allocated in PESC, decisions on the statutory age of schooling, etc.) The control is a macro control. In expenditure terms it is reasonably effective - the estimates prepared by the Expenditure Steering Groups are accurate to within one or two per cent, and from the point of view of controlling national spending successive governments may feel satisfied that the blunt

instrument they wield has stunned without destroying, and enabled them to exercise a large degree of control over expenditure in the public sector.

As a control it is not designed to produce fine adjustments - whether they are sudden turns to port or starboard! - and it deals in generalities. Local government of course retains the freedom to overspend or underspend, but collectively has tended, for a variety of reasons, to keep close to governments' wishes. The national control could indeed be more brutal, more macro, and more positively directed towards a firm central grip on total spending. Whilst recognising - however hypocritically - the virtues of local authority freedom, national government could set more precise overall targets for local authorities building them on the assumed needs of individual services. It would then be the business of the local authority to raise the appropriate sums of money to supplement the government grant, and decide in its turn on the allocation of money to its services.

Layfield could have pointed the way through these thickets, but powerful forces in central government, including particularly no doubt those in the Department of the Environment and the Treasury, were not prepared to take the risks which would have followed the possibility of implementing more precise controls on spending in return for allowing local authorities more flexible powers to raise income locally. The expenditure targets set by central government would have represented a minimum or maximum level, or indicated a band for spending. Local authorities would have retained freedom, probably within overall limits, to raise as much money for the services they provided as they felt was the wish of the local community.

But why should central government give local authorities this degree of independence when there is a powerful existing control in RSG? Does it work? So far as centralist economists are concerned the answer must be 'yes'.

How does it work at local and institutional levels? The tanker has been fully commissioned, launched, and set on an overall course. Local authorities, who must have felt in recent years

that they were in a permanent financial Bay of Biscay, are responsible for maintaining it on course. Some vessels travel more slowly than others, all are beset by changes in the elements (inflation, industrial action), and sometimes by conflicting orders from 'head office' where the management occasionally alters! The position of the local authority is made no easier by its dependence on government decisions in the autumn of the previous year, which affect the income it raises itself and the level of its services. Its decisions are subject also to un-predicted population movements, inflation, and wage and salary settlements - which increasingly are coming to be made retrospectively. The Treasurer's need for a crystal ball of unusual translucence is considerable.

The wonder is not that it works but that it works so well. Local government is caught in a vice between those who want more and those who would spend less. The vice is always there but for local authorities and their institutions the pressures depend primarily on decisions by central government. Decisions in the national interest have a remote appeal, and little local reality. It is when the decision is translated into a larger rate demand, or a reduced service, that the citizen awakes to the consequences. And local government is only two-fifths financial master in its own house.

What has this meant locally? For the ratepayer this has meant increases which exceed inflation because central government has reduced its contribution, and for the consumer, services which are reduced even though the rates are increased. For those concerned the most serious consequence is that overall national decisions - even when they are based on sound national economic needs - may have almost unpredictable, and certainly widely varying, results locally - and there is a danger that the variety, which stems principally from national considerations, will be transmitted through the vice in such a way as to damage the reputation of local government.

In times of growth the balance of power works well. In times of difficulty it produces strains which may lead, for the wrong reasons, to shifts of control. The responsibility of national

government to control overall expenditure is acceptable; in doing so, however, it should not avoid the matching responsibility of establishing the expected level of service. Beyond that point, it should be prepared to allow the responsible - and accountable - local bodies to raise the funds necessary to support the services, and to improve them beyond the minimum national level where they wish to do so.

At local and institutional level this leads to corresponding decisions about minimum levels of service, and freedom to decide how to attain them. The dilemma, if it is one, between efficient centralisation and local autonomy can be settled in a mature way by decisions on minimum levels and standards, and freedom to choose how to attain them. The ballot-box should tell us what we want - a mature democracy should then be capable of deciding how best to achieve it. In this situation, to return to the first question, financial control should not be a proxy for management, but a positive part of it, and one which should operate at all levels to ensure that the maintenance of agreed standards costs no more than it should. The Treasurer cannot dodge his responsibilities: we should not dodge decisions on levels and standards.

SCHOOL RESOURCES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT: TEACHING STAFF, THE PRIMARY RESOURCE

Patrick Bailey

Senior Lecturer in Education
University of Leicester

This paper attempts to identify those key school activities in resource use which have to be recognised and performed effectively if the teaching and learning in a school is to produce results.

'Resources' is a much misused word. In schools it is often taken almost exclusively to mean 'teaching software'. But the primary resource of a school, indeed its only primary resource, is its teaching staff. All its physical resources are inert and consequently of secondary importance. Their educational value depends wholly upon their mastery and deployment by staff.

The central importance of the teaching staff as a school resource becomes evident as soon as other kinds of resource, especially buildings and teaching and learning resources, are considered. Buildings are sometimes thought of as 'the school', just as a building in which people meet for worship may mistakenly be called 'the Church'. Both are assemblies of people for common purposes; it is important to perceive schools as communities of people which use their buildings to serve their educational purposes. This perception is essential if staff are to integrate their buildings into the total teaching/learning system of their schools.

The difficulties of making such an integration are well known; but the first and most important step is to conceptualize the desired functional relationships between

the aims of the curriculum, the teaching methods employed, pastoral care systems and buildings. Failure to work out these relationships in detail can produce staff unease and an unspecific dissatisfaction with 'the buildings'; whereas staff dissatisfaction would more properly be directed at the imperfect adjustments between curricular process and building frame. Structural alterations are rarely necessary to improve this adjustment. What is usually required is a systematic effort to break the mesmerism of customary space use and to re-deploy space in support of clearly articulated curricular policies. Even where space use appears to be satisfactory, it is worth enquiring whether conditions of relative comfort cloak the need for curricular re-thinking, if not for this year then for five years hence.

At this stage, an external consultant can sometimes help. He is free from preconceived notions about what certain parts of the school can and cannot be used for and who should use them. Conversely, he may also be unaware of the historical and political processes which have led to present use and which may make change difficult.

To assist in the process of making school buildings serve the curricular wills of teaching staffs more effectively, an accessible body of 'case law' is needed which describes ways of using and adapting buildings to support a variety of curricular ends. The compilation of such a collection of exemplars would now appear to be a key activity for the teaching profession if optimum use of existing buildings is to be achieved.

The crucial importance of the teaching staff resource is again evident when the use of the physical resources of a school, other than buildings, is considered. A book, a worksheet, an overhead projector or an item of laboratory apparatus only become educational resources when pupils begin to learn by their means. The teaching staff alone can bring this situation about.

A resource item will not even arrive in school until a teacher knows of its existence and recognizes its possible uses. Once in school, its effectiveness will depend upon the extent to which individual members and groups of teaching staff understand its possibilities and possess or develop the skills needed to exploit those possibilities. The educational effectiveness of the resource item further depends upon the skill of staff in deploying it; in establishing and using appropriate cataloguing and retrieval systems, for example. In turn, such systems depend for their effectiveness upon the quality of each teacher's own personal organisation. It is a myth to suppose that the nature of a resource determines its method of use; this depends upon the knowledge, ingenuity and skill of staff and the quality of a school's resource-handling procedures.

Obtaining money to buy physical resources is not a key activity for schools; and it is particularly important not to think it is when money is in short supply. Resource procurement follows logically upon decisions about curricular content and process. Therefore, the key activity in the whole area of resources is the staff activity of curriculum design and implementation. The fundamental question is never, "What book shall we buy?" but "What should this school be trying to achieve through its curriculum?" Only then can the first question be answered in better than piecemeal fashion. This second question requires that answers be sought for another question, even more fundamental: "What does it seem likely that our pupils will need to know and be able to do, as adult, in the latter part of this century and the first decades of the next?" Upon our answers to this question will depend the kind of curriculum we construct and the teaching methods we employ and therefore, the kinds of physical resources which we need.

It is possible to propose some tentative answers to this last question. Technological changes now in progress may reasonably be expected to continue. If they do, then much of the specialist knowledge and many of the established skills which schools give to their pupils will be of no more use to

them than blacksmithing a decade or less from now. Secretarial and office skills are a case in point. The micro-electronics revolution is beginning to transform office practice; and a recent APEX report (Tyler, 1979) suggested that 250,000 secretarial jobs will disappear in Britain alone during the 1980s. At the same time, many new jobs may be created by the new technology. A recent survey (Wilkinson, 1979) suggested that up to one million jobs could be produced in micro-electronics in Western Europe by 1987. Writing in 1968, Peter Drucker (1971, pp.8-9) forecast that "The coming decades in technology are more likely to resemble the closing decades of the last century, in which a major industry based on new technology surfaced every few years, than they will resemble the technological and industrial continuity of the last fifty years.... Knowledge, during the last few decades, has become the central capital, the cost centre and the crucial resource of the economy."

Whatever the details of the new world which we have already entered, it seems clear enough that individuals will have to be adaptable if they are to survive in it; which means that they must learn to think for themselves and be both prepared and equipped by their education to go on learning. Thinking must therefore become the central activity of the curriculum. If we wish our sixth formers to think and learn for themselves, we must develop the skills of independent learning and thinking from the primary school upwards. If this indeed is our priority, certain things follow in the area of resource use. Teachers will need to acquire (if they do not possess them already) the planning and managerial skills necessary to establish and sustain active learning situations; timetables will have to be constructed to support learning rather than teaching; physical resources will have to be designed, produced and deployed to the same end.

If the argument so far is sound, it follows that there are four key areas of staff activity upon which the effective use of physical resources depends. These are:

1. Curriculum design and implementation

As a first priority, it is necessary to develop staff expertise in designing and working curricula which serve defined general aims, especially the systematic development of independent learning. Such an aim can easily be no more than a pious platitude; it need not be. Whole-school curricular aims can only be achieved through staff collaboration. If schools are to produce the firmly-grounded generalists which the times seem to require, they can only do it through a whole-staff operation.

2. Resource design and production

Resources for teaching and learning have to be produced to support general curricular ends, such as those outlined above, as well as the more familiar, specific subject ends.

3. Dissemination of 'method' expertise

The methods of using new physical resources have to be explained and demonstrated to teachers more systematically than heretofore: to misquote Marshal McLuhan, "The method is the resource". The way a teacher uses a new resource alone determines whether or not it is innovative.

4. Use of technical help

To be fully dffective in teaching and managing a 'learning' curriculum, which inevitably relies upon the use of apparatus and school-generated materials, teachers require the support of technical staff. Such staff are not an optional extra but central to the curricular process. Ways of recruiting, training and deploying such staff in schools in more systematic ways have to be worked out, at national and even more at school levels.

This paper has tried to take the discussion of resources and their use firmly away from a mere discussion of materials and their management, important though this management undoubtedly is. It has been suggested that

policies about resources always turn out to be policies about people; that the teaching staff of a school is its most important and only primary resource; and that the way in which a school uses its staff will always determine how well or how ill it uses its other resources.

References

Council for Educational Technology (1978), Microelectronics: Their Implications for Education and Training. CET.

Drucker, P.F. (1971), The Age of Discontinuity. Pan.

Tyler, C. (1979), "Microelectronics threaten up to 250,000 office jobs," Financial Times, 20 March 1979.

Wilkinson, M. (1979), "Microelectronics may create 1,000,000 more jobs," Financial Times, ibid.

EDUCATIONAL COSTING FOR TROUBLED TIMES

John Fielden

Senior Manager
Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co.

The Setting

Educational administrators have seen wave upon wave of financial crises and austerity purges; yet to an outsider they appear to survive with remarkable urbanity. Statistics which emerge later show the service to have grown in range and volume, even though we can never measure the extent of some unfulfilled needs. Perhaps, however, this time the service is facing a more serious threat, which will call for surgery rather than slimming pills. Perhaps, therefore it should seriously look for ways of carrying out critical self-examinations. In the belief that this is the case I intend in this paper to describe the contribution that educational cost analysis can make to better educational policy-making and management. I am comforted by the fact that others see costing as important: Peter Newsam (1978) lists as his first point in considering the consequences of falling rolls that new costing techniques will have to be learnt; Professor Briault (1979) likewise thinks officers now have a duty to identify the true cost of some educational practices, and show them to members.

Outside the Education Department policy reviews and analyses are becoming increasingly quantitative. Since the demise of program budgeting and PAR (programme analysis and review) other buzzwords have gained favour: accountability, value for money, and cost reduction. In their most recent publication CIPFA (1979) define the latter as "systems, activities and ideas which aim to assist in the more economic and efficient provision of services." They suggest that the methods should be adopted not by accountants but by all those officers who exercise direct control over real resources. If educational cost reduction is to mean

anything, it must involve a better understanding of the relationships between the resources invested in education, their costs in money terms, the conversion or educational function and the outcomes. For many people, and for almost all outsiders, this input-output process has been a black box surrounded by very professional barbed wire.

Critical analysis of services and their costs will involve two broad categories of question:

- What are the educational needs and which areas should be met by the authority (or institution)?
- How should these needs be met in the most cost-effective way possible?

The first line of examination relies primarily on social and political inputs before it can be answered; it therefore makes little call on costing techniques. With the second category, however, we enter the complex world of costing methodology and are forced to seek answers to many of the questions concerning resources, costs and outcomes.

The Tool

Costing is the art of measuring the consumption of resources in financial terms. Contrary to most perceptions there can be a large element of subjectivity in costing exercises. There are often no easy ways of measuring resource use or of converting it into money terms, and the person carrying out the costing will therefore have to make assumptions or value judgements. Even in the commercial world, where measures are easier, accountants are being forced to develop national and international standard approaches to some of their problem areas. As educational costing is still in its infancy as a discipline, the conceptual difficulties are barely recognised, let alone understood. In this section of the paper, therefore, I plan to describe an approach to costing educational activities which will take the many imponderables and immeasurables into account.

Before beginning to collect and piece together cost data it is essential to think through the nature and objectives of a cost

analysis. There are six groups of questions which should be faced:

1. What is one costing? Is it an existing activity or a change because of altered resource use? Is it a clearly defined project or cost centre?

2. Why is a costing being undertaken? Is it an investment appraisal prior to commiting expenditure, or a mid-term review deciding whether to continue a project or activity, or is it a critical evaluation in retrospection?

3. For whom is the costing being undertaken? What level is the audience - individual, departmental, institutional, divisional, regional or national? What costs and what budgetary conventions will this audience use for its decision-making? Will it be interested in the cost implications at any other level or can these be ignored (even if they influence behaviour at these levels)?

4. Are outcomes or benefits to be considered? The answer will depend on the nature of the outcomes. Perhaps, unusually, the activity produces cash income or saves expenditure; should it not be netted off against the cost? More likely an outcome will be immeasureable and qualitative - educational value added, for example. If so, should it be considered and whose perception of the benefit is valid? Where a change in outcomes is claimed, how can one identify this? Are any measures relevant? What does one do if benefits are identifiable, but not realisable ('saved' teacher time of an hour a week).

5. What timescale is relevant to the costing? Are we looking forwards or backwards, and if so, how far? Do we take the useful life of the resources or equipment into account?

6. Are we considering alternatives? If we are carrying out an investment appraisal, we may well already be comparing possible future uses of the same money. If we are not, should we not take the opportunity cost into account? Might there not either be better ways of carrying out the activity for less resources or alternatively greater benefits to the service, if the resources were diverted to another educational activity? In these questions, I am sure, lie

the main potential area for educational costing. I return to this point later.

Once these questions are answered we can then define the style and content of the costing. It becomes possible to plan how to carry it out, since we should have agreed:

- which resources to measure, over what time period;
- which units to measure them in (time, £, square-meters, etc.) and whether to link costs and outputs in some form of unit cost;
- which cost techniques to use in producing financial figures, (absorption or total costing, incremental costing, marginal costing)?
- how to present the answers to decision makers.

If there is agreement on these points, the costing can become a relatively mechanical exercise, involving data collection and measurement, conversion into costs, the analysis, and finally the presentation.

It will have become clear that it is not always easy to cost some educational activities: even where we can establish a link between a resource and an output (a teacher and a pupil's examination score, for example) we can never study the process to find whether a teacher plus £100 of in-service training will improve that examination score. Nor should we even rely on the score as anything other than a measure of the ability to pass one particular examination. Many educational expenditure decisions have thus become acts of faith or value judgements which follow precedent or fashion.

I must resist the temptation to explore the conceptual difficulties in educational evaluation and turn to the more common technical problems that will arise in costing educational practice. Four principal areas deserve comment:

(a) How should one treat development activity undertaken for the benefit of future years? Should it be treated as capital

expenditure and written off over the period which benefits, or is it wiser to write it off as it is incurred? Where there is a major development project would not this present an unfair view of the operational costs later on?

(b) Is it practical or necessary to apportion indirect costs to educational activities, and can we not concentrate merely on direct or incremental costs?

(c) How should capital or non-recurrent costs be treated? Even though central and local government do not account for the use of capital assets once they have been purchased, is it not desirable to adopt some kind of charging out or depreciation system to reflect their use? If we do adopt this approach, do we use historic or replacement cost basis for calculating such a charge?

(d) Finally, we have to face the issue of the complexity and comprehension of cost studies. If cost analyses are rigorously and professionally carried out, they can become complex and bewildering to inexperienced decision makers. Therefore, a common sense compromise has to be sought between the need to communicate and the desire for perfection; yet one must not abandon the clear statement of assumptions and qualifications adopted in a costing, if the results are not to be misquoted or misunderstood.

These problems are not insurmountable and should not be over-emphasised.

I have described this approach to costing at some length because I wanted to illustrate its versatility to all kinds of educational activity. I believe it can be a powerful tool in evaluating either existing or proposed programmes. Clearly it does not stand alone, since a critical financial verdict on an activity may well be overruled by professional judgement on qualitative grounds. The troubled times we face make financial evaluations increasingly necessary and add weight to their conclusions. While no one could, for example, deny an Authority's right to approve a programme which claimed to produce substantial educational gains at high cost, few could approve a decision to

invest similar funds in an activity whose qualitative outcomes were doubtful and long-term. Let us now explore some ways in which educational costing can be used to help in decisions.

The Application

Financial evaluation techniques have until now been applied principally to major educational innovations or projects, although they are equally relevant to appraisals of existing activity. Analytical tools and techniques are not brought into use until a change is contemplated and a decision called for; education departments and higher education institutions have been very reluctant to change the status quo, to question the base budget; and whole edifices of planning have always assumed the continuation of last year's provision. However, the era of zero base budgeting has finally arrived: basic provisions will have to be questioned, since only by cuts in them can funds be found for essential developments (and perhaps even increases in statutory provision) elsewhere. Cost analysis will thuse be a crucial tool in reviewing existing programmes.

My firm's involvement in more than 40 cost analyses and financial evaluations has helped us classify various types of educational activity, in each of which cost analysis plays a slightly different role.

1. The most common category is the wholly educational one where costs are incurred to produce solely qualitative educational outcomes. Cost analysis can measure the resources, but has to be content with trying to state (usually imperfectly) the outcomes claimed. Most educational changes or projects fit into this category, since they involve an extra investment of resources for claimed extra educational outcomes. Many case studies exist showing how such projects can be costed (Fielden and Pearson, 1978a, 1978b).

2. A rare subset of the above category is where existing resources are reorganised to achieve greater educational outcomes: the same investment of resources produces more. Cost analysis can be used to identify the rearrangement of

resources, but cannot confirm any claims for qualitative gain. The category represents one of the two classic definitions of cost-effectiveness (holding inputs constant while increasing outputs) and will be one of the principal sources of economy in current reviews. A simple instance of applying this concept would be to increase class size and produce 'more education' for the same cost in teachers, although many people would argue with the assumptions concerning educational outcomes.

3. Much educational effort is invested in development activity which produces benefits or savings later. Three kinds of 'savings' activity have been identified: those in which an investment and a return can be neatly quantified in money terms (rare in education); those where both sides of the equation involve resources other than money and thus need not be converted into financial data (see case study C in Fielden and Pearson (1978a) where academic time was invested in order to save academic time later); and finally, those in which a whole mix of different resources are involved with a complex balance between gains and costs.

   There are instances of educational changes being introduced which claim to save money. These are clearly a major target for cost analysis, as they represent the second plank of cost-effectiveness, achieving the same outcomes with fewer resources. Since the main value judgements needed in this instance are whether levels of outcome will remain or have remained constant, the qualitative element in the decision is less significant than in many cost analyses. The main burden of proof lies on the costing to show that there could be or has been a saving of resources. We have come back to cost reduction, the current CIPFA phrase for improved efficiency in the use of resources.

We can now summarize the roles of educational costing as an aid to decision making. It can play a part in reviews of existing activities and proposals for change of the following kind:

- Assisting in major policy decisions such as the effect of

a series of primary school closures or the introduction of sixth form colleges. Unlike conventional methods of costing the approach outlined in this paper would illustrate the resource implications of the policy changes from the viewpoint (and budget) of several audiences (authority, community, parents, etc.) and identify some qualitative implications of each option.

- Evaluations of existing programmes to give part of the answer to the question, "Is it worth it?" As well as resource data, information on outcomes and performance will be sought and varying relationships between cost and performance would be examined.

- Identification and appraisal of resource implications of alternative programmes or ways of achieving the same educational ends, either at the outset prior to investment or during a programme by a reorganisation of the resources invested in it.

- Identification and appraisal of alternative uses of the same resources to produce greater or better outcomes (the opportunity cost approach).

The Society of Education Officers (1975) suggested that the then pressures called for "a greater need to justify, reappraise and consider alternatives in the use of resources". Most of the tools they proposed for the job (programme budgeting, matrix management, management by objectives and output measurement) have proved too complex and time-consuming, and have not been widely adopted. It is vital that the current challenges are faced with more resilient weapons. I am convinced that financial evaluation or educational costing is a necessary and fundamental one of these.

References

Briault, E. (1979), reported in Education, 13 July 1979.

CIPFA (July 1979), Cost Reducation in Public Authorities: a View. CIPFA.

Fielden, J. and P.K. Pearson (1978a), Costing Educational Practice. Council for Educational TEchnology.

Fielden, J. and P.K. Pearson (1978b), The Cost of Learning with Computers. Council for Educational Technology.

Newsam, P. (1978), The Consequences of Falling School Enrolments: an Education Officer's View. Sheffield City Polytechnic, Department of Education Management (Sheffield Papers in Education Management, No.1)

Society of Education Officers (1975), Management in the Education Service: Challenge and Response. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

THE RUNNING COSTS OF AN INDIVIDUAL SECONDARY SCHOOL

B.A.A. KNIGHT

Headmaster
Holyrood School
Chard, Somerset

This paper reviews the costs incurred in operating a secondary school, and considers some of the ways in which costs might be reduced in such schools. The school concerned is Holyrood School, an 11-18 comprehensive. In September 1978 there were 1170 pupils on roll, including 80 in the sixth form. The teaching staff numbered 63.2 plus the Head; with 67 responsibility points in addition to the Head and two Deputies. There is a reasonable non-teaching establishment, headed by a Bursar. The school's premises are 10-20 years old, barely adequate in terms of space for classes, although there are quite extensive grounds and fields. There is one kitchen, and an average 377 meals were served each school day. School transport is provided for about 35% of the pupils. There are a fair number of evening classes and lettings, but no young wing or community tutor.

The following is a summary of the total costs of the school for the financial year 1978-79. These costs exclude the services of an Educational Welfare Officer (provided by the Social Services Department), and the salary and administrative costs of adult/youth/community activities (but do include full premises costs, including those for evening use).

Costs Outside the Control of the School

1. *Central LEA expenditure apportionable to the school for services rendered:*

	Amount	%		
Central administration	29,300	4.1		
Recharge, County Library	1,760	0.2		
Debt charges	71,890	10.2		
Careers Advisory Service (approx)	7,030	1.0		
Educational Psychological Service (approx)	1,810	0.3		
Residential Centre (approx)	2,350	0.3		
Training of teachers (centres, courses)	2,800	0.4		
Transport of pupils, recharge by Couty Surveyor	1,200	0.2		
Education Museum Service	1,000	0.1		
	119,140	16.9		
2. *Rates*	24,470	3.5		
	143,610	20.3	143,610	20.3%

Costs Controllable by the School

1. *Teaching Costs*

Salaries, teaching, with on-costs	374,610	53.0		
Salaries, admin., technicians, library etc.	36,600	5.2		
Capitation allowance	20,980	3.0		
Examination fees	6,960	1.0		
Linked courses	4,000	0.6		
Postage and telephone	2,760	0.4		
	445,910	63.1	445,910	63.1%

2. *Premises*

Salaries	26,580	3.8		
Maintenance	9,620	1.4		
Heating and lighting	9,670	1.4		
Water	910	0.1		
Cleaning materials and equipment	2,630	0.4		
	49,410	7.0	49,410	7.0%

3. *Grounds and Swimming Pool*

Salaries	7,650	1.1		
Maintenance, grounds	3,100	0.4		
Swimming pool	420	0.1		
	11,170	1.6	11,170	1.6%

4. *Services to Pupils*

Assistance to pupils (grants, free mile etc.)	6,540	0.9		
School meals, net cost	24,850	3.5		
School transport	24,960	3.5		
	56,350	7.9	56,350	7.9%

TOTAL COSTS	706,450	100.0	706,450	100.0%

Unit Costs for Holyrood School can be derived from the above. They sharply confirm what we already knew - that education is inevitably a costly service.

UNIT COSTS

Whole School Costs

Total cost for one year, 1978-79	£706,450.00
Total cost for one school week (of 38)	18,590.00
Total cost for one school day (of 190)	3,720.00

Costs Per Pupil

Cost of educating one pupil, per year	604.00
Cost of educating one pupil, per school week	15.90
Cost of educating one pupil, per school day	3.20
Cost of educating one pupil for one 35-minute period (taken as 1/40 of the week)	.40
Cost of educating one pupil for one period per week for one year	15.00
Cost of educating one pupil for 4 periods per week for one year (a typical course)	60.00
Cost of educating one pupil for 5 years, for 4 periods per week (e.g. cost of teaching one subject such as French)	300.00
Cost of non-lesson time for one pupil for 1 year (i.e. assemblies, registration and tutor-time, if costed proportionately)	120.00

Costs Per Class (of any size, with one teacher)

Cost of educating one class for one 35-minute period	9.00
Cost of educating one class for 4 periods (e.g. a week's French)	36.00
Cost of educating one class for one period per week for a year	345.00
Cost of educating one class for 4 periods per week for a year (a typical course)	1,380.00
Cost of educating one class for 4 periods per week for 5 years (an example of a 5-year course)	6,900.00

Cost Control and Analysis

It is unfortunate that the systems developed by LEAs to control and particularly to analyse costs are still relatively primitive. The normal method is to negotiate a detailed forward budget for the next financial year, and then to monitor expenditure closely so that the various budget allocations are not exceeded. Within its limits this system works very effectively. However, no commercial organisation could survive such flimsy information base and without developing more sophisticated techniques.

There are several serious defects in the present system:

1. Schools are seldom fully, or even substantially, aware of their own costs. Computers feed them an increasing amount of cost information. However, it requires a good deal of collation and interpretation, and is seldom complete. It falls far short of the very detailed and comparative information which many industrial firms supply to their own 'profit-centres'.

2. LEAs and their institutions make little use of comparative cost data. There is comparison of LEAs under various headings, largely on a league-table basis; and LEAs make some comparison of expenditures from one year to another. But on the whole comparative costing has a very low priority. There is little attempt to compare costs in detail on either a percentage or a 'per pupil' basis, either for the LEA or for separate institutions, over a 5 or 10 year period. There is little attempt to compare costs in detail between institutions or LEAs.

3. There is even less attempt to analyse costs. Expenditure is traditionally presented in a Treasurer's format, rather than one related to use. There has been little progress so far in introducing a 'cost and management accountant's' approach.

4. Schools are not accountable for their costs. It is very rare for a Head to be held accountable to Governors, LEA

or anyone else for the running costs of his establishment.

However, the difficulties should not be under-estimated. Schools, with their slow annual cycle, do not lend themselves to the monthly cost statements and rapid policy adjustments of the industrial world.

Alternative Cost Strategies

A cursory glance at the running costs of a school and at its organisation reveals a cost-accountant's nightmare: a highly labour-intensive organisation, with ill-defined objectives, with uncosted and unquantifiable outputs and ill-costed inputs, with a straight-jacket of cost-unrelated constraints, and with an arthritic lack of flexibility in buildings and staff. In this situation a cost accountant would look first to economise. It would help if our vocabulary distinguished much more strongly between 'economise' (doing what we do now, but with reduced expenditure) and 'cuts' (doing less of what we do now). Scope for economies will vary considerably between schools and LEAs. My own LEA, relatively poor and adversely affected by changes in the Rate Support Grant, has worked desperately at economies this last few years, so that there is no fat left, and little lean either.

Devolving expenditure to schools may lead to economies. Capitation was always devolved in this way, and recently LEAs have devolved other areas such as postage and telephones. But there are serious dangers. Unless the devolved areas can be kept self-contained, losses in one area can drain another - e.g. heating in a severe winter can reduce capitation. Also, one large devolved fund seems less protected against inflation than several small ones.

Other economies can be achieved from changes in organisation. Greater occupancy of buildings could be achieved by closing under-utilised schools, or even by a two-shift system. However, the running costs for buildings and grounds at Holyrood is only 8.6% of the total, so on this basis it would require closure of 12% of Somerset secondary school

capacity to achieve an overall economy of 1%. Moreover, such measures are traumatic, and could lead to a lack of capacity at a future date. There are also often additional expenditures involved in closures.

Other economies could arise from changes in working practices - longer Christmas holidays to save fuel, or a shorter lunch-hour (care has to be taken here that this does not force up numbers taking school lunches). The savings from such measures are small - in the order of 0.1%.

The scope for economies should not be over-estimated. At Holyrood, for example, the areas susceptible to 'economies' (as opposed to 'cuts') amount to only 17% of total costs - and only 10% outside meals and transport. So even if 10% economies could be achieved (and this would be extremely difficult, or impossible, in some areas) a saving of only 1.7% of the total school costs would accrue.

So our cost accountant would rapidly look for more effective approaches. He would immediately come up against the fact that over 50% of a school's expenditure is irrevocably committed to teachers' salaries, and any reduction can only lead to a worsening of the pupil-teacher ratio. It is true that there has been little research to show that a worse pupil-teacher ratio leads to lower standards of performance; but it is also true that the appeal of the independent schools has largely lain in their promise of small class size. Most other items are also related to the compulsory education commitment - capitation allowances, examination fees, linked courses, upkeep of premises and grounds, assistance to pupils, salaries of ancillary staff. It is this remorseless commitment to feeding every pupil with the same input of education whether he likes it or not, whether he benefits or not, whether he progresses or not, which bedevils any scrutiny of school costs. Education, per hour, is a very expensive business; it is time we questioned whether the present form of

distribution is the most cost-effective.

One possible avenue of escape is to transfer some items to the consumer. It can be argued that free meals and uniform, school meals and transport, are not strictly 'education'. They are certainly substantial items of expenditure - at Holyrood, 8% of the total. Charging the full cost of school meals to consumers would save 3.5% of the cost of Holyrood; charging 50% of the transport costs would save 1.7%. If the Social Services Department or the Department of Health and Social Security took over assistance to needy pupils, this could save 0.9%, but this is perhaps less attractive, since it is merely a ledger transaction.

There are other possibilities for transfers. Pupils could be charged for textbooks, stationery and materials, possibly saving 1-2%; all external examination fees, 0.7%; all 'frill' activities (e.g. music, swimming, 0.2%?); or full charges could be made for community/adult education (equivalent to up to 0.5% of Holyrood costs). And in the last resort, annual charges could be made for education, rather like dental charges.

However attractive transfers of expenditure may be, we should not delude ourselves that they are in any way an increase in productivity, or a decrease in real costs. Then what alternative strategies are available?

1. A shortening of the period of compulsory education. This could for example involve a later start (say 5½ years); perhaps half-time education 4-6; a lowering of the school-leaving age. Savings here are less than at first appears. If 10% of pupils left a year early, the saving could be about 1% - but it is difficult for this to be fully realised, since contractions of groups midway during a 4th/5th year course do not necessarily release staff. Earlier leaving in the middle of the 5th year is of little value.

2. Changes in the working day. There are two main possibilities. The 'Continental Day' of 8am to 1.30pm packs in the present contact hours and saves school meals (3.5%), free meals (0.5%) and possibly gives some economies in heating, lighting, water, telephone. However, this form of day is a pretty gruelling business, particularly in winter, and in a society with such a high proportion of working mothers, brings social problems. The 'Flexi-day' is a more sophisticated version which overcomes these problems. This involves e.g. inserting 90% of the present contact hours into the morning (say 8.30 to 1.30) with a variety of optional activities in the afternoon. This produces a more humane morning, allows for 'baby-sitting' in the afternoon if desired, and injects a welcome element of flexibility into the rigid school timetable. There are, however, obvious problems in rural areas in relation to transport.

3. Changes in the working week. For this, changes in the present DES Schools Regulations would be necessary. However, if these Regulations were re-written to read that 800 hours of 'secular instruction' must be provided each year, then each LEA and each school would exploit the most cost-effective way of providing this. There would be several possibilities:

   (a) A four-day week, decanting 5 days' schooling into four days, say 8.0am to 4.0pm. This would save 20% of school meals, free meals, transport and cleaning, say 15% of heating, lighting, water and possibly some ancillary services, in all perhaps 2.5% of the total;

   (b) A four-day reduced week, reducing the present contact time. This would bring financial benefits, but would imply a definite 'cut' in contact hours.

   (c) The 'Flexi-week', as outlined above. It seems to offer much more flexible and cost-effective provision, at a saving of about 3.5% of the total costs.

   (d) A shorter working year, say 180 days, with the days

saved allocated to in-service education and to cutting out the not very productive post-examination period at the end of the summer term. Savings would include 5% of school meals, free meals, transport, cleaning, most ancillary services - amounting to about 0.5% of total costs.

Fortunately, progress in the area of school costs could be made easily, rapidly and cheaply:

1. LEAs could give much higher priority to school cost control and analysis;
2. LEAs need to supply much more extensive cost information to schools;
3. LEAs need to require Heads of schools to present annually a detailed statement of their school's running costs, to governors and staff;
4. The DES, LEAs and schools need to explore the alternative strategies suggested above;
5. LEAs need to provide some in-service training in school costs for teaching staff at all levels;
6. Universities and colleges might encourage more research into and academic study of school costs.

References

Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, Education Estimates Statistics. CIPFA, published annually.

Coombs, P.H. and J. Hallak (1972), Managing Educational Costs. Oxford University Press.

Cumming, C.E. (1971), Studies in Educational Costs. Scottish Academic Press.

Fielden, J. and P.K. Pearson (1979), Costing Educational Practice. Council for Educational Technology.

Knight, B.A.A. (1977), The Cost of Running a School. Scottish Centre for Studies in School Administration, Moray House.

Knight, B.A.A. (1979), "Why 800 hours a year should replace the school day," Education, 16 November, p.548.

Knight, B.A.A. (1980), "What does a school cost to run?" Education, 22 February 1980, p.199.

THE ECONOMICS OF SMALL SCHOOLS: SOME CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Tim Simkins

Department of Education Management
Sheffield City Polytechnic

The number of small primary schools in England and Wales has been declining for most of this century. Now, however, small schools are being threatened, as perhaps never before: firstly by the fall in the birth-rate, and secondly by the economic situation and the public spending cuts associated with it.

These new threats are ironical in that they arise at a time when political and social factors seem to be causing the case for small schools to be reconsidered. Furthermore, whereas until now the problem of small schools has been seen as an essentially rural problem related to rural-urban migration, it is increasingly likely that urban schools, especially in inner cities, will be threatened, as the falling birth-rate and intra-urban population movements make their effects felt.

The purpose of this paper is to explore some of the economic issues which arise when the closure of small primary schools is considered. It is hoped to demonstrate, not only that economic analysis is relevant, but also that the issue of primary school closures illustrates in microcosm many of the difficulties encountered in making a more general application of economic analysis to education.

Different writers use different criteria for defining a school as small. The most frequent approach is to use an arbitrary enrolment limit such as 70 (Garvey, 1976) or 100 (Boulter and Crispin, 1978). Davies (1975, p.76) has suggested that:

> ... the small primary school may be defined as 'a primary school in which the head teacher in addition to his overall responsibilities as head is in full-time charge of a class'.

Such approaches have limited value, however, because 'smallness' is, in fact, essentially a policy-determined variable. A primary school is 'small' when a local authority decides to assess its viability with a view to deciding whether or not it should be closed; and decisions concerning any individual school will depend upon a finely balanced set of social, educational, demographic, financial and legal considerations with the weight given to each being determined, as with all local authority decisions, by a balance of professional and political judgement.

The Plowden Report suggested clear guidelines for minimum school size, but few authorities have found themselves able to accept these.[1] The reasons for this are well illustrated by the following quotation:

> Now you may know that the Plowden Committee's recommendations for rural areas was the establishment of schools of three classes with a minimum of 60 on roll. This was in fact the official Lincolnshire policy; but it was realised that if this policy was implemented throughout Lincolnshire it would mean that 107 schools would be at risk of closure because that's the number we had with fewer than 60 on roll. The County Council decided that would be too drastic and the members quite like small schools anyway. So the outcome of political reconsiderations is that we shall be limiting our intentions in the immediate future to schools with fewer than 30 on roll. That reduces the number at risk significantly, but the falling birth-rate will, of course, bring more schools down to that figure. (Double, 1978, p.27).

Such arguments may suggest that, since politics is so important, there can be little point in analysing in depth any more objective considerations relating to the minimum size of school. This paper however, does not take this position. Despite claims of many pressure groups to the contrary, most authorities <u>do</u> consider all aspects of the situation before deciding on closure; and the economic aspect is one among many, although it may receive greater weight now than in the past.

In considering the issue of school size, the starting point must be the unit cost. These loom large in the criteria for closure outlined in Circular 5/77 (DES 1977, para. 6), and it may be argued that if costs per pupil in a small school are substantially higher than the average for all schools in an authority, there is, in the absence of any countervailing arguments, a prima facie case for closure.

The little information which is available does suggest that economies of scale exist in primary education and the unit costs of very small schools in particular seems to be considerably higher than the average.[2] How useful is such information for policy-making? To answer this question we need to look more closely at the underlying issues involved. An Authority considering the possibility of closing a small school is likely to be faced by three laternative forms of provision (or some combination of them):

(a) transfer of children to an existing school or schools which has excess capacity;

(b) transfer of children to an existing school or schools which would require expansion to receive them;

(c) the construction of a new school, perhaps to receive children from a number of smaller schools which are to be closed.

Each alternative is likely to have different cost implications and an economic approach to a decision concerning closure would require the following:

(a) an estimate of the resource savings arising from closure;

(b) an estimate of the additional resource costs arising from the proposed alternative form or forms of provision;

(c) an evaluation of the relative educational and social benefits (and costs) arising from the existing school and from the proposed alternatives;

(d) a balancing of the net savings (or costs) in resources against the net educational or social benefits or costs accruing.

on pupil/teacher ratios and the provision of books, equipment and materials on a strict *per capita* basis. Yet there is a strong case for arguing that such costs might more reasonably be considered to comprise both fixed and variable components. Thus each school would have some basic provision in terms of staffing, equipment and materials, in relation perhaps to some concept of a 'core curriculum', with additional resources being related to pupil numbers in the conventional way. This principle is accepted in effect by many local authorities which allow more favourable pupil/teacher ratios for small schools, or supplement capitation allowances to compensate for smallness. Furthermore such an approach is now being used by the DES in its calculations of teacher numbers required at a time of falling rolls:

> The calculation is based on a formula which allows for the number of teachers in each school to be directly proportional to the school roll, and for one additional teacher in each primary school and two additional teachers in each secondary school. This has been found to fit quite closely the pattern of staffing standards in schools of different size; and while it obviously does not represent exactly the pupil/teacher ratio in individual schools, it gives for the country as a whole results very similar to those of a large-scale calculation taking account of the actual relationship between staffing standards and school size. (DES, 1978b)

However, local authorities' resourcing policies for small schools seem to be based on little more than some general belief that small schools, to be viable, need additional resources beyond their *pro rata* entitlements, and the actual amounts provided seem quite arbitrary. The DES formula merely represents a very crude rule of thumb based on extremely aggregative data. Yet, if the concept of fixed and variable components of running costs is accepted, it is surely necessary to move beyond arbitrary mark-ups in *per capita* provision, or extrapolation of existing resource patterns, to a more fundamental consideration of what balance between fixed and variable components is desirable in educational terms.

Some of the potential economies arising from primary school

reorganisation are largely independent of educational policy. This is true, for example, of such buildings-related costs as maintenance expenditure, which provide a minimum 'fixed' element in current costs owing to their relationship with buildings characteristics rather than pupil numbers. Other potential economies, however, depend on policies concerning resource provision to schools, and these in turn must bear some relation to ideas about educational needs arising from different patterns of organisation. The concept of a 'fixed' element in staffing or materials provision must depend on views concerning the minimum level of resources necessary to meet, for example, essential curricular requirements. Such a question is not primarily an economic one.

If a proportion of direct current costs can be considered fixed then the implications of the three alternatives mentioned earlier for such costs are likely to be as follows:

(a) if children are transferred to an existing school with spare capacity no fixed costs will be incurred and probably few variable costs either;[4]

(b) if children are transferred to an existing school with no spare capacity no fixed costs will be incurred but variable costs will be;

(c) if a new school is built both fixed and variable costs will be incurred but the required level of fixed costs will be incurred once only, whereas this amount will be saved in each of the schools being closed to make way for the new school.

In all the above cases, therefore, it is likely that greater savings in direct current costs per child will be made at the closing school than the marginal costs incurred at the receiving school; and these will be additional to any savings which may accrue in terms of capital or indirect current costs.

Such an analysis of marginal costs can only take us so far, however, in considering the economics of decisions concerning

small schools. Whether we are calculating average or marginal costs it is conventional to express results in per pupil terms. But such data merely reflects differences in the provision of resources for education. They do not, in themselves, necessarily indicate anything about the quality of service provided as a result of the application of those resources. In other words, they tell us little about educational output, or more particularly, about the relation between the resources expended and the results achieved. Cheap education is not necessarily economic education; for the most economic form of provision will be that which provides the greatest educational and other valued benefits in relation to the costs incurred. Data on costs per pupil by themselves will always be inadequate for decision-taking therefore, and will need to be supplemented by information concerning the quality of education provided as a result of the resources expended.

The relevance of this argument can be well illustrated with respect to small schools. For example, staffing levels in small schools, while normally representing more 'favourable' ratios in a numerical sense, may be less optimal educationally than in larger ones. This is because the very small number of teachers, all of whom are likely to be in full-time charge of a class, leaves little slack, either to permit special talents to be utilised for the benefit of the school as a whole, or to overcome problems arising where the abilities of individual teachers prove to be limited.[5] In other words, teachers' talents may often be less effectively deployed in small schools than large ones and this will represent an opportunity cost in terms of primary education provision in the local authority as a whole. Similar arguments may apply to other resources. If the greater total capitation provision available in a larger school permits a wider variety of books and equipment to be bought and efficiently used, then there will be an improvement in the quality of the educational environment available to the child even though there may be no financial saving on this item as a result of reorganisation.

Such arguments depend on educational rather than economic evidence, but they emphasise the importance of supplementing

data about resources utilised (such as unit costs or pupil/teacher ratios) with information concerning the quality of education provided with these resources.

The argument of this paper has attempted to indicate the implications of applying economic analysis to the question of primary school closure. It is to be hoped that it has demonstrated the relevance of such analysis, while at the same time suggesting its limits. In particular such limits are reached when we attempt to assess the outputs of education, against which resource use must ideally be judged, and when we attempt to identify the most appropriate patterns of resource provision to achieve desired educational results. In both of these areas our present state of knowledge is still quite limited and consequently policy-makers tend to fall back on arbitrary formulae and rules of thumb.

Thus even if it can be shown - and it often can - that school closure will produce resource savings, any final decisions still depend on the value attached to educational and social outcomes judged to be associated with different patterns of provision. At present we can often demonstrate that one of a number of alternative courses of action is 'cheaper'; but without knowing something about outputs we cannot show that it is 'more economic'. The final decision will continue, therefore, to depend on judgements which may give varying weight to estimated educational, social and indeed political outcomes.

Notes

1. For details of LEA policies on small primary schools, see Rogers (1977).

2. For example, see Cumming (1971, ch. 9), Coatesworth (1976) and Nash, Williams and Evans (1976).

3. Average cost may be defined as total cost divided by the number of pupils enrolled. Marginal cost is the additional cost incurred by enrolling one extra pupil.

4. Few variable costs may be incurred in this case because such costs may rise in discrete steps rather than with each marginal increase in enrolments. Thus if classes are below capacity in the receiving school some additional children can be enrolled without increasing the number of staff. Strictly speaking such costs should be termed 'semi-variable'.

5. Relevant in this respect is the discussion of the use of specialist teachers in the recent HMI survey of primary schools (DES, 1978a).

References

Boulter, A. and A. Crispin (1978), "Rural disadvantage: the differential allocation of resources to small rural primary schools," Durham and Newcastle Research Review, 8:41, Autumn.

Coatesworth, D. (1976), "Is small still beautiful in rural Norfolk?" Education, 148:14, 1st October.

Cumming, C.E. (1971), Studies in Educational Costs. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Davies, E. (1975), "The small primary school: problem or paradigm?" Forum, 17:3, Summer.

Department of Education and Science (1977), Falling Numbers and School Closures. Circular 5/77.

D.E.S. (1978a), Primary Education in England: A Survey by H.M. Inspectors of Schools, H.M.S.O.

D.E.S. (1978b), "Falling rolls 8: What the DES is planning in teacher numbers," Education, 152:23, 8th December.

Double, E. (1978), "Can the village school survive?" in The Country Child. Lincoln: Centre for the Study of Rural Society.

Garvey, A. (1976), "Closing down the village schools," Where? 119, August.

Nash, R, H. Williams and M. Evans (1976), "The one-teacher school," British Journal of Educational Studies, 24:1, February.

Rogers, R. (1977), "Closing village schools: what the LEAs are up to," Where? 133, November/December.

Simkins, T.J. (1980), "The economics of smallness: the case of the small primary school," Educational Studies, 6(1):79-91.

MANAGEMENT IN THE LIGHT OF FALLING ENROLMENTS

MANAGEMENT IN THE LIGHT OF FALLING ENROLMENTS: CHANGING ROLLS AND ROLES

Keith McWilliams

Deputy Secretary
The Schools Council
London

This paper is concerned with the fact of falling rolls and the effects of such a process upon those within the education system. The reality of this situation cannot be denied, but there is less certainty about (1) the extent and duration of the decline; (2) the inter-relationship between this trend and other factors influencing educational provision at the present time; and (3) how the 'professionals' in the service will respond and adapt, both at the macro and micro levels. Given this pattern in the 1980s it is necessary to re-appraise, to plan with sensitivity, and to safeguard those principles upon which the whole service is founded.

The General Situation

The statistics of falling rolls are well attested. By 1986 the primary school population will have declined by something approaching one third, and by the end of the 1980s the secondary school numbers will have falled by the same proportion. Clearly, there is a margin of doubt about the figures, particularly when trying to allow for the staying-on rate, but it is not my purpose here to examine the detailed projections and evaluate the possible effects of such trends.

It is not possible to examine the drop in numbers as if this was an isolated phenomenon constituting the only problem to be tackled at the present time. This audience will hardly need reminding of the following unpalatable facts of

educational life which constitute the major professional concerns of most of us, namely:

(1) the political changes, particularly those resulting in an 'interventionist' policy on the part of the elected representatives, especially obvious at the local level, the growth of authority on the part of members and a diminution of the power of officers. In many LEAs control which was formerly implicitly in the hand of committees is now explicitly based upon the elected body, with a consequent change of function on the part of the administrator;

(2) economic factors - the first topic has been largely experienced by administrators, advisers and senior teaching staff, but everyone in the service has been affected, and will continue to be so, by the severe financial cut-backs. It is painful but necessary, to stress that without this factor it is probable that the discussion about falling numbers could have been debated with equanimity and, possibly, keen anticipation as a genuine rise in quality could be expected;

(3) attitudes towards education: we are currently in a period of uncertainty concerning appropriate aims, objectives, curricular methodologies and modes of organisation for our schools. On all sides there are questions about what schools are for, debate about standards, conern about the basics, the nature and content of the curriculum, the examination system, 16-19 provision and beyond. The DES Primary Survey and particularly the Secondary Survey, which is expected by the end of the year, raise critical issues, which all combine to make educationists nervy and defensive in attitude, just at a time when we should be grappling with the task of devising an appropriate education for children who will spend virtually all of their 'working' lives in the twenty-first century, with all the attendant issues relating to the imminent technological innovations and their social consequences.

The Human Factor

Management is practised by people usually upon a much larger group of fellow human beings. Therefore, we cannot ignore the effects of the situation just described upon those who constitute the educational service. In concentrating upon the professional's career and predicament, I am not dismissing the needs of pupils and their parents, but I am arguing that their needs will be better met by an efficient service with a higher morale than that which exists at present.

Most of us will have spent nearly all our time in education coping with the stress and challenge created by a continuous period of expansion; we are now faced with a long period of decline and it is hardly surprising that this makes severe personal demands upon us at the very time when we are being asked to maintain a firm, or even ruthless, attitude towards reducing the service.

It is of utmost priority that we learn how to manage ourselves in this complex situation. Some are capable of responding positively and face the challenge of the situation, but the majority find themselves greatly disturned by the prospect and adopt a variety of strategies whereby they come to terms with reality and, if possible, reserve at least some of the principles which took them into education in the first place. In such a world there is no respector of persons - the chief officers, the college principal, the headteacher are all as vulnerable as the clerk trying to explain admission policies to parents, the lecturer with no students or the teacher faced with redeployment or even redundancy.

Obviously, the picture is not as bleak as that, otherwise the service would have ground to a halt long ago, but the tell-tale indicators are there, for example, industrial action, decline in 'voluntary' activities, energies devoted to inter-departmental disputes rather than improving one's own performance, the absence rate through illness, and the queues seeking early retirement.

We are all too well aware that it is difficult to effect economies in the education service because we belong to a labour intensive industry. The corollary of that statement is that we are a service based upon the interaction of people, at its fundamental level we exist to facilitate the teacher-pupil relationship, so it can hardly be too idealistic to suggest that one of the hallmarks of the present situation should be the humanity with which the service responds and adapts. It could be argued that such an aim is quite unrealistic when confronted with factors which could entail the loss of jobs or the enforced transfer of children from one school to another because of a closure, but, although the ultimate decision may be harsh and controversial, this does not necessarily mean that we subscribe only to the 'survival of the fittest' philosophy. I would submit that this is a major task of education management today - the identification of the 'pastoral needs' of the service and the development of skills necessary to undertake such a role, which will not be an alternative to pre-existing functions, but will be added to an already extensive list of responsibilities, regardless of level. The stresses of the process will not disappear until the causal factors are changed, but we must learn how to cope with those conditions without losing our humanity.

The School: Purpose and Planning

As I indicated earlier, there is a need to help schools define their aims and objectives, as well as the organizational system created to implement such a philosophy. In one sense this need is strictly irrelevent to the subject of declining rolls, but it is highly related to the need for a clear definition of the purpose of a school in order that it can create a framework which will enable it to survive the effects of cuts and smaller numbers in particular. Such a task will have to be faced and tackled by staff of a school but it would be unrealistic and undesirable to expect them to do so in isolation. Help in assessment and evaluation is an obvious example of a likely need for reinforcement and support, so we can discern a management 'need' to ensure that schools have the means and the opportunities to ensure that they are

equipped to answer questions about their purpose and the means thereby they achieve their stated goals.

The Schools Council is aware of this strong pressure to provide support for schools in this direction, hence it is giving high priority in its new programmes to this issue.

Purpose and Planning in Schools

This programme is intended to develop the effectiveness of a school's staff as a professional team. It will be concerned with such questions as how schools:

1. decide their curriculum aims;
2. plan their curriculum - choice of subjects, experiences and ways of learning; balance, standards;
3. relate to the world of parents, to governors, to their local community, and to employment;
4. organize links with other schools and institutions - continuity, co-operation;
5. prepare for change - in curriculum, organisation, numbers on roll;
6. organise and run their school, including the way they use specialist teachers;
7. agree the organisational framework for 1 to 6 above;
8. acquire the requisite managerial and interpersonal skills for 1 to 7 above.

It is our contention that falling numbers strengthen the need for such an emphasis and programmes in order to help establishments to identify their own priorities and organise appropriately. But it is recognised that such a process is demanding of staff time and assumes commitment, which is now a fragile assumption because of the other forces affecting schools and their influence upon attitudes and morale. Hence, the Council further recognises that much more consideration should be given to the needs of individual teachers in the 1980s.

Helping Individual Teachers

The teachers' task and the environment within which he/she works is as difficult as it has ever been. Without falling rolls it would have been hard, so this is yet another example of a problem being compounded. By concentrating upon the arithemtical dimension it is not intended to discount other issues, such as problems of discipline, financial cuts particularly in capitation, continuing uncertainty about school organisation, examinations, etc., but within the subject of this paper it is necessary to focus upon those issues largely identified by the fact of declining numbers.

When jobs are at stake inevitably the first reaction is to close ranks and take all necessary action to safeguard them, so it is naive to expect there not to be a hardening of attitudes and action in such a climate. Indeed, it would be inconceivable to imagine that, first of all rumours, and then announcements of school amalgamations or closures should not produce feelings of fear, anger, confusion, betrayal, despair amongst those who are the existing staff of such threatened establishments. It is likely that most of us here have been at the other end of this process, i.e. we have (reluctantly) drawn up plans which will effect the required economy and results with (hopefully) the maximum efficiency and the minimum harm, we have made all the calculations and projections and made the necessary recommendations to our political masters and then faced staff and parents, enduring the criticisms and accusations. But it is one thing to give assurances publicly or to a whole staff of a school, it is another to receive such words and to know that your job is at stake and the future is no longer neatly divided into terms and vacations.

Efficient managers in such a situation must plan effectively, of course, and ensure that people most involved and at risk are kept informed rather than relying on the distortions produced by rumour-spreading. They must also be decisive, particularly when the task is unpleasant. But they should also understand that for many people the proposed action is not a plan to be implemented but an activity to be

experienced.

Cuts will always be costly in terms of human relationships, if nothing else. I cansider that, not only should we act as compassionately as possible, but that we should act professionally and endeavour to be as supportive as resources permit in helping teachers to tackle their job efficiently. The Schools Council will endeavour to help meet this need bythe following programme.

Helping Individual Teachers to Become More Effective

This programme is intended to develop teachers' skills in their work as individuals. It will be concerned with:

1. Patterns of learning and child development;
2. Learning styles and skills;
3. Teaching styles and techniques;
4. Teacher-pupil interaction;
5. Diagnostic assessment;
6. Assessment of children's learning and progress;
7. Self assessment by the teacher.

This occurs at a time when training opportunities are being cut, too, with fewer secondments, fewer LEA courses, doubts about teachers' centres and problems of release and covering in schools. Yet individual teachers need reassurance and some stability amidst the doubts and quicksands. It is the Council's judgement that this should, through the teachers' professionalism, competence and efficiency, provide a further base for such development and thereby, restore something of the pride in being a teacher, and the authority which is derived from expertise rather than from any imposed authority bolstered by sanctions. It follows that the corollary of such a process is that teachers not capable of producing this qua-ity of work should not be kept in a job at the expense of those able to make a good contribution - this remains a problem and we are far from defining a 'good' and 'bad' teacher in a way which is both manageable and fair. One effect of falling rolls could be that we are forced to

reach agreement on this contentious issue.

The Curriculum and a Changing World

Inside the school external constraints are now influencing what can be taught, so we can regard the environment within which the curriculum is implemented as being very much a changing world. This situation is further compounded by the fact that the needs of pupils preparing for life in the twenty-first century are requiring a reappraisal of that curriculum.

This is the key question arising out of the falling rolls issue, as Frances Smith said in Education, 30 March 1979:

> Until somebody is willing to define what the minimum curriculum is in secondary schools we are not likely to come up with an answer to the question of when schools cease to be viable.

This takes us to the hub of the problem, because arithmetical formulae are only one process whereby we can identify questions related to staffing, pupil numbers and viability of individual institutions, the other side concerns the function of such an establishment, and this must entail a definition of what is the minimum curriculum necessary to secure the achievement of purpose.

This is a delicate area and many of us are already suspicious, for instance, we now have a government which apparently is seeking to proceed in two directions (at least!) at the same time by assuring everyone that it will ensure that standards improve while at the same time inflicting severe financial cuts upon education. If you were at the Society of Education Officers Conference in July, you will have heard Lady Young refer to maintaining standards by concentrating upon the "essential fabric" and the "vital elements" of the curriculum. Taking such a statement alongside the other DES activities such as the 11-16 curriculum appraisal project currently being undertaken in 41 schools in five authorities and the forthcoming Secondary Report, it is hardly surprising that many people show some disquiet about pressures which could

lead to a rigid application of a narrow curriculum.

Potentially this could become the most significant outcome of the present declining numbers 'game'. In its role as the national forum for education, the Schools Council is well aware of both the growing concern within the service and the increasing numbers of senior educationists who are arguing that the school curriculum must be protected and that this will not be achieved by piece-meal measures or left to chance solutions, but, rather, it will only be successful if there is a national agreement on a framework for the curriculum - this being very much the view of John Tomlinson, our Chairman, as many of you will recognise.

To this end, the Council has also proposed a major programme based upon helping schools to identify the key issues relating to the curriculum for a changing world in the following terms:

Developing the Curriculum for a Changing World:
Developing Basic Skills and Preparing for Life after School

The Council is concerned with four aspects of the curriculum: content, skills, ideas and attitudes. This programme is intended to improve children's grasp of certain basic skills, and to prepare them for life after school.

We intend to help teachers to develop in pupils the following basic skills and abilities at levels appropriate to the pupil's age, ability, and other characteristics:

1. verbal communication (speaking, listening, reading, writing;
2. numerical;
3. graphic (interpretation and production of visual materials);
4. logical;
5. scientific;
6. study (use of library, references, note making);

7. social and personal education;

and to help them prepare their pupils for life and work after school. We shall try to promote competence and capability through work in:

8. political and economic understanding;
9. education for life in a multiracial society;
10. vocational preparation and vocational choice;
11. technological awareness;
12. environmental education and outdoor pursuits.

Obviously such a programme will largely apply to existing curricular patterns and the components reveal the priority concerns of our member interests. But it is recognised that refining or redefining parts of the curriculum may result in an improved menu, as far as some dishes are concerned, but such a process is insufficient unless we appraise the purpose and nature of the whole menu, given an awareness of resources available. Therefore, in addition to its major programmes for 1980-83, the Council will also begin to support the development of a general framework for the curriculum.

> There appears to be support for developing the general framework for the curriculum and the Schools Council, with its LEA, DES and teacher members, is ready to help develop such a framework. We believe that teachers, schools and local education authorities would welcome a lead from the Council. Subject to any comments our member interests may make, we therefore propose to engage in discussions about curricular balance and content, and to take an appropriate part in any other national discussions.

It would be rash to expect that it will be an easy task and foolish to expect that it will be possible to complete it in a matter of months. Nevertheless, there is a compelling urgency, which is at least as significant as the forward-planning necessary to produce a coherent system into the 1980s. Until, and unless, a national agreement is reached on the national curriculum, it will be impossible to plan effectively other than by the

numbers game. But there are many potential pit-falls!

For example, the cry for a national curriculum could be met by a centrally imposed, rigid and narrow definition linked to a galaxy of measures of achievement designed to produce evidence of standards on a national basis. Such an action could ride rough-shod over the growing awareness of the unique blend between the open curriculum of a school and the shared values and attitudes transmitted by that community.

Another potential hazard is to regard this as a problem to be solved by the academic specialist in curriculum theory. Obviously we will need the stimulus of their contribution, but the process of identifying a school curriculum must involve dialogue between many parties, including providers and recipients.

We must also avoid starting from too narrow a base, i.e. by examining the range of subjects available and choosing the most freuqntly mentioned. To do so assumes that such a list would provide the 'core', but it does not follow that all pupils would experience the whole package. Also, such a starting-point could lead to the ommission of those elements of the curriculum which are not necessarily contained entirely within the formal subject areas. Increasingly, employers are saying that not only do they seek school leavers with basic skills but also young people who are capable of understanding and responding to guidance, able to work together, showing reliability and initiative, plus the all important contemporary attribute - a willingness to adapt to change. Such requirements immediately raise the issue of social and personal education, careers education, the affective development of pupils - in other words, the former 'hidden' curriculum is now exposed and accepted as an integral part of the total menu.

Only when we have reached agreement on such issues can we indicate what a school exists to do and, having done that,

we can then assess the human and physical resources necessary for that school to achieve not only its aims but the agreed curriculum. Until such time, administrators are working half-blind - they are all too familiar with the effects of declining resources and the need to reduce the service in that respect, but they are not able to stand up with any confidence and say that there are agreed definitions and that if such definitions are to be met it follows that resources will have to be provided within the context of a framework for deciding viable options. Individual schools, parents' groups, associations are fighting a rear-guard action and will need to do so for some time to come, but ultimately, we will only succeed by their national initiative.

The educational provisions in this country is a national issue and the allocation of resources rightly remains the responsibility of those elected to undertake this function; but the decisions should be made in the light of a reasonable definition of a school's task, rather than the simplistic attitudes prevalent amongst some members within national and local government.

To conclude, I quote Martin Pick from the Guardian, 10 July:

> The basic questions are: What kind of education do we want for our children during the next ten or twenty years? What standards are we aiming at, what objectives do we hold, and what relationship should exist between education and society? But no one asks those questions.
>
> Administrators are concerned with finding acceptable administrative answers to intractable problems. Of course we are all concerned with quality in education, they will say, as professionals, dedicated to provide the highest standards. But there is no evidence of their asking these questions afresh while they decide about premises and staffing ratios. The teachers' main preoccupation has sadly been with fighting a rear-guard action to preserve the status quo.

For everyone of us the falling rolls will mean that our personal role is changing too. Having come to terms with that we must find ways of managing the changing roles of our individual institutions, otherwise there will be several

generations of pupils and students at risk just at a time when we need the strongest possible system capable of meeting that challenge of the changing roles in the country as a whole. This is a management issue, but fundamentally, it makes us question the values on which our service is based.

FALLING ROLLS AND THE REAPPEARANCE OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING:

PLANNING FOR CHANGING SCHOOL ROLLS IN LEEDS

D. Cracknell

Research and Planning Officer
Leeds L.E.A.

In 1974 local government reorganisation added a ring of former West Riding County Council areas to the Leeds County Borough, and Leeds now includes industrial centres like Morley, Pudsey and Rothwell; small market towns like Otley, Guiseley and Wetherby; as well as rich farming areas which embrace Boston Spa and small but affluent commuter villages. The total population of Leeds has, until recently, been stable at about ½ million, which makes it the largest metropolitan district after Birmingham. Leeds has been one of the few cities where most of the population losses from its inner areas have been offset by increases in the outer areas, although there is now an overall fall in total population.

The education system in inner Leeds is organised with 9-13 middle schools and in outer Leeds on infant/junior and 11-18 secondary high schools, with one area in the north-west operating 8-12 middle schools. The system is fully comprehensive and all secondary high schools have or are in the process of establishing sixth forms. With 237 primary schools, 68 middle schools and 51 secondary high schools and a total school population in January 1979 of 137,552, Leeds presents a rich variety of contrasting educational institutions.

The national phenomenon of a falling school population and its effects on primary and secondary schools, as well as its anticipated effects in further and higher education, are well known and should need no elaboration. However, LEAs and areas within each LEA face changes which differ substantially in size

and nature. In Leeds the total school population began to fall from a peak of over 140,000 in 1976 and 1977 but the peak for primary schools was in 1972 and for secondary schools in 1978. To illustrate the size of the projected decline in school rolls, estimates of total middle and high school age groups have been produced which show falls of about 25% by 1986 and 1989 respectively (see Tables 1 and 2) from a 1978 base.

Table 1: Projected Total Middle School Age Groups in Leeds, 1978-1986

Sept	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86
Total	44441	43709	43363	42294	41037	39235	36739	35257	33496
% of 1978	100	98.4	97.6	95.2	92.3	88.3	82.7	79.3	75.4

Table 2: Projected Total High School Age Groups in Leeds, 1978-1989

Sept	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89
Total	34731	34642	32070	33373	32687	32256	32208	31245	30058	28178	26702	25504
% of 1978	100	99.7	92.3	96.1	94.1	92.8	92.7	90.0	86.1	81.1	76.9	73.4

Individual age groups differ somewhat. In September 1978 there were 11,105 11-year-old children in schools in Leeds, but by September 1988 it is expected that there will be about 7,150 - a fall of approximately 35%. Inner and Outer Leeds show different trends of school population - the peak year for primary numbers in Inner Leeds was 1971 but in Outer Leeds it was 1976. There are also marked local contrasts within the two major areas of Leeds, including some significant rises in school population as well as falls of 50% or more, over the next decade.

In seeking to formulate and implement appropriate responses to these changes the staff of the Leeds Education Department, no doubt in common with colleagues in other LEAs, have discussed the issues at length, gathered information and experience from other areas, organised seminars within the Department and built

into the in-service training of teachers a consideration of the implications of changing school rolls. Some of the suggestions for action by the Authority which arose during the course of these discussions favoured a kind of 'master-plan' response. There were those who favoured reorganising the middle-school system, rationalising sixth-form provision and closing all schools below prescribed sizes. There were others who pressed the need to determine a core curriculum and guidelines for the use of surplus accommodation. So, in one way or another, there was quite a strong body of opinion which supported the preparation and forceful implementation of a comprehensive strategic plan for the whole Authority. However, what has emerged so far has not been a 'master-plan'. Apart from the fact that there seemed to be little political support for long-term plans, the overall strategic approach could not take adequate account of the local variations. It was quite clear that 'falling rolls' was not just a matter of deciding whether or not to close schools. Virtually every school would have to meet the challenge of readjusting to changes in pupil numbers. It was not a case of the Authority finding the answers and simply applying them, but of each school, in close association with the Authority, facing up to the implications and shaping its own future. In the process some of the decisions and actions would be most appropriately taken by the local authority and others by the school, but the Director and his colleagues felt that a shared approach to the issues was essential. This view was confirmed at a conference run by the Aurhority on changing rolls in schools which was attended by headteachers from all types of school; and the Education Committee subsequently gave formal approval to the initiation of a series of discussions with schools.

It was agreed at the conference that every school should be sent a forecast of its pupil numbers in each age group up to 1989/90 for primary schools, to 1993/94 for middle schools and to 1995/96 for secondary high schools. The forecasts were the best estimates that could be made from information available in the middle of 1979 and sought to take into account the recent rise in love births. In addition, the forecast form

contained projections of the staffing entitlement, group and points available for the school over the whole period, on the basis of the currently agreed policies of the Education Committee and of the present provisions of the Burnham Report. Schools were asked to discuss the implications of the forecasts and to give particular consideration to such things as pupil organisation (vertical grouping in primary schools or cooperation between schools for sixth form provision, for example); curriculum (specialist subjects or high school options, for example); staffing (problems and opportunities for teaching and non-teaching staff); the effects on staffing structures of changes in group and point scores; accommodation (needs, surpluses or changed use); relationships with other branches of the Education Service (further and community education, careers service) or the wider community.

Beginning in September 1979, the Authority is attempting to implement its joint approach and to give as much support and encouragement as possible by arranging the first of what may well be a series of meetings in each school. In the first instance these meetings will be held between the headteacher, the school's general adviser and, wherever possible, the professional administrative assistant for the area in which the school is situated. The discussions will be informal and open-ended but the local authority staff onvolved will try to ensure that key issues are raised and will record and feed back to the Department comments and recommendations which might need wider consideration. It is envisaged that these school reviews will continue over years rather than months, and will evolve as the pressure of changing rolls increases and the participannts learn from their experience. Some general principles and policies may arise from these discussions, and if they do the schools and the Department are likely to be better prepared for their implementation and more account can be taken of local needs and special difficulties.

The English education system reflects a well-established national preference for decentralised decision making. Amongst educational administrators there has also long been a body of

opinion committed to the principle that changes in education should occur in a humane and evolutionary fashion and that wherever possible they should be effected on the basis of a consensus. It is natural, therefore, to believe that such educational planning as is required for effective and sensitive decision-making will be diffused and not centralised. Nevertheless, it is not necessarily recognised or even accepted by local education authorities that educational planning is a function that should be shared, and planning is often left to a relatively small number of people.

Under these conditions and with the growing complexity of society, it is becoming increasingly difficult to reach a consensus of view on educational issues of all kinds. For the LEA to attempt to plan with even less regard to the diverging views it encounters would serve only to alienate and to isolate the education service. Although consultation is already a feature of the work of the LEA, in the future educational planning may well be under pressure not simply to consult but to devote more time to the positive creation and maintenance of a consensus of opinion. What could be envisaged is the further development of a co-ordinating and persuasive role for planning. In pursuing such an objective and also in attempting to increase the sensitivity of policy making in the LEA, the various elements of educational planning (co-ordination, forward planning, monitoring and evaluation) may need to be performed in a more explicit and open manner, which will undoubtedly mean involving more people. The issues raised by a falling school population are such that LEAs are already under pressure to engage in positive planning. It is already quite obvious that planning for expansion and planning for contraction are quite different. Negative or purely reactive responses to isolated problems and opportunities are unlikely to be adequate, but neither would an extreme form of autocratic planning seem likely to work.

Although experience in Leeds is admittedly limited, it would suggest that the early involvement of schools in planning the formulation of more localised responses to demographic change is of primary importance. In Leeds the preferred approach has

been to try to involve schools in a process of co-operative analysis and deliberation which will both prepare the schools for the changes to come and, by feeding back the outcome of these discussions, re-orientate the policy preoccupations and administrative arrangements of the Authority. There are several advantages to the approach. Firstly, there is currently little enthusiasm to close schools, and an approach which emphasises a philosophy of learning to live with smaller schools rather than struggling to remove 'surplus' institutions is more likely to match political realities. Second, the close involvement of schools encourages a healthy interest in the internal distribution of resources. Thirdly, it is hoped that the process will help to reduce the introspection and isolation that is apparent in some schools. Finally, since co-operative or federal arrangements may realistically constitute one of our few immediately available responses to falling numbers, especially with respect to post-16 education, the sooner that the practical problems are faced and resolved the better. Even if general solutions emerge in the longer term, they will need careful interpretation and adaptation to each school, so it makes sense to begin with the needs of the institution rather than with comprehensive plans for reorganisation, rationalisation and closure.

There are potential dangers in this approach. With projections of school numbers over ten or more years it has been suggested that their degree of accuracy is so low as to falsify any conclusions which might emerge. There is also a risk that an exercise like this in schools might raise premature and short-lived enthusiasm for action which loses impetus before the full impact of the practical problems are encountered. Alternatively some schools may be so thoroughly demoralised by the prospect that they resort to defensive action and entrench themselves as best they can in their existing practices. Lastly, the vagaries of national and local decisions - whether based on political, financial or even educational considerations - are bound to introduce an important element of doubt and unpredictability into the school reviews. It is salutary to recall the sense of frustration felt among staff in some colleges of education,

especially in the mid 1970s, who, after being encouraged to spend months or even years of work in developing curricula which were sufficiently 'diversified' for survival in the future, soon found themselves faced with the closure of their institutions. These objections are certainly valid to a greater or lesser extent but they cannot reasonably be used to justify a complete abdication of responsibility for planning and, unless a better approach can be found, these dangers need to be recognised but then overcome.

The role of the educational planner is sometimes seen as an attempt to find ways of crystallising and putting into practice, strategic objectives. By contrast, that role can also be looked at in terms of a series of tactical decisions which aim to steer a course between conflicting interests and pressure groups. The two models have been described respectively as 'conceptual' and 'conflictual'. Within LEAs the experience of seeking to manage the consequences of changing school rolls might well be a factor in producing a shift in emphasis in educational planning towards one or other of these models. In Leeds the closer involvement of school staff, advisers, education officers and other interested parties in a more open process of planning and implementing an appropriate response to these changes could be interpreted as a shift towards the tactical or 'conflictual' emphasis. Whatever labels we use, the management of changing rolls certainly provides us with a good opportunity to re-examine the assumptions which underly much of our present planning. International experience suggests that educational planning often becomes fashionable whenever the education system has to face up to new or particularly pressing problems. If there is now to be a renewed interest of this kind, we ought to decide whether the existing forms and processes of educational planning are appropriate for the kind of problems which are being posed. If they are not appropriate, what new approaches need to be developed? It is in this context that the experience of Leeds might be considered.

POLICY FORMATION TO COPE WITH CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY: A U.S. EXPERIENCE

John L. Davies

Assistant Dean
Anglian Regional Management Centre
North-East London Polytechnic

The recent decline in the U.K. birthrate, with its attendant consequences for school and college enrolments, has been generally received with considerable gloom and despondency by the British educational fraternity. The prospect of a decline in demand following hot on the heels of a decline in supply clearly has the potential of causing some impressive upheavals within the system, and whilst we have not been unused to upheavals, they have generally been those associated with growth or merger rather than contraction. Over the last decade various parts of the U.S.A. have experienced some savage contractions in local school enrolments resulting in some equally savage repercussions in educational delivery systems, and, qually significantly, the manner by which those systems are governed and managed.

The author has examined declining enrolments in the States of Utah and New York, and this paper reports some aspects of this study, with reference to the process of policy formation and the attendant inter-group dynamics in Salt Lake City during the period 1969-78, as these relate to the sharp drop in school enrolments and growing incidence of school closures. The purpose of the study was to gain perspectives on problems likely to be encountered in the U.K., and on approaches which might be usefully translated into a U.K. context.

The Nature of Declining Enrolments in Salt Lake City

Salt Lake City is in the throes of a continuing decline in the school population, for a variety of reasons, including stabilisation of birth rates, migration of young families due to housing costs, urban clearance for business and transportation purposes, especially near the centre of the town. The overall school enrolment has thus declined from 40,000+ in 1958 to just over 20,000 in 1979.

One related consequence is that financial aid from the State of Utah which is based on Average Daily Attendances (ADA) also fell, there being no 'hold-harmless' protection arrangements. No fiscal advantages followed, since expenditure does not fall in parallel (other than as a step function when whole groups/units are removed). Thus:

- expenditure in total does not fall other than on an 8-10 year time span;
- per capita expenditure increases;
- there is an inability to reduce fixed costs significantly;
- inflation fuels the problem;
- expenditure on building maintenance and administration rises proportionately to direct instructional expense.

Increasing tax burdens therefore fall on the school district, to maintain standards at existing levels (other things being equal).

Surplus building capacity became steadily apparent, i.e.:

	Capacity 1970	Enrolment 1970	Capacity 1974	Enrolment 1974
Elementary	20,120	17,727	17,660	14,106
Junior High	8,400	7,758	7,700	6,493
Senior High	8,729	7,442	8,400	6,574

Though the severity of the various manifestations of decline differed with particular interest groups, all groups perceived the threat of school closures, decay of neighbourhoods, staff redundancies, increasing use of busing, worsening of educational standards, and increasing community conflict, as being apparent. The challenge for administration was thus to make the district solvent without creating tax revolutions; close schools without provoking community warfare, and reduce the labour force without paralysing the entire school system - not markedly different from the problem confronting British education! Let us examine what policy making process emerged, and examine its effectiveness.

The Process of Policy Formation

The data collected in this case has been analysed using an extension of a Four Phase Model of Policy Formation first advanced by H.G. Enderud, and refined by the author. The contention of the model is that an effective policy formation process can be managed by ensuring that events follow four distinct phases. These may be summarized as follows:

Phase 1. Bull-Session: Diagnostic mechanism to make visible to each other - problems
- solutions
- choice opportunities
- potential participants.

Sorting out mechanisms for elements to connect themselves with each other to further proceedings.

Phase 2. Negotiation: Mechanism for engineering or drafting outline solution recommendation, and for providing initial agreement on its possibilities. Usually handled informally, covertly, or in small assemblies

Phase 3. Persuasion: Mechanism for applying decision criteria to test solutions for social acceptability, resource feasibility to decision-takers and implementers/ consumers of decision. Decision acquires legitimacy in largely autonomous sub-units. Norms of 'collegiality' and democracy need to be honoured.

Phase 4. Bureaucratisation: Mechanism for supplementing and modifying previous mechanisms. Identifies variables previously left out or forgotten. Makes decisions fit for implementation, operational and precise.

Analysis of the Process of Policy Formation

The data in this case has been analysed using this model. Specifically, it should be noted:

1. The sequence is based on a gradual evolution of the planning decision, to ensure that there is a proper allowance for an essentially highly ambiguous period (Phase 1); a political period (Phase 2); a collegial period (Phase 3); and an implementation/executive period (Phase 4). These reflect higherto alternative views of the institution as an organisation. To miss any phase, or to allow insufficient time for it, is to invite problems subsequently, since one may find that, for example, the wrong participants have been coupled (Phase 1), or that one comes to Phase 4 without having tested a key group's support of the planning proposition. This 'jump-over' of a phase may well create the necessity of a 'loop-back' - if one is in Phase 4 which is clearly not working, a return to Phase 1 may be necessary to redefine the problem, or to Phase 2 to build a workable coalition of interests; or to Phase 3 to use additional validation criteria in respect of the proposal. The 'loop-back' may be a decision of the sensitive administrator who realises the necessary foundations have not been laid: on the other hand, (and less desirably!) it may be forced on him by hostile groups who are just not happy with having a possibly ill-conceived and partially tested decision thrust upon them.

2. Whilst one may have a specific planning strategy in mind to cope with a series of real or perceived problems, one does not start by exposing this as the ultimate in human experience within the 4-phase model! On the contrary, the starting point is a close definition of the dimensions of the problem to which one's plan is related in terms

which (a) appeal to people from various positions on the power spectrum, and (b) is internally consistent with any preferred solution one may have. The administrator then has the considerable advantage of being one who is in the business of identifying problems rather than indiscriminately peddling bright ideas which may be perceived as irrelevant. Planning in this context thus has a very strong element of problem diagnosis;

3. The administrator has a significant role of creating communication links and dialogues between parties who may have the capability of developing perspectives on a planning problem. They may be part of some formal structure or a key member of an informal group which nevertheless has something positive to offer. Not all of these people need necessarily figure, or wish to figure, in each phase.

4. The administrator will recognise that there are many arenas in which action in any of the four phases can take place. Enderud indeed makes the point that the formal Phase 3 which gives ostensible legitimacy to the planning proposal or document is likely to be the emptiest in terms of real argument and contribution. Other vehicles have therefore to be devised - ones which are appropriate to the needs of the particular phase concerned; ones which make most sense to the participants one is trying to involve; and ones which take the pressure off the administrator. Administrators left 'holding the baby' of a particular problem or specific solution are easily turned on or deserted when hard choices are needed. Using the four-phase processes to share the ownership of problem or solution with others therefore is important;

5. Associated with this is the question of openness. In research undertaken by the author, there was no doubt whatever that administrators who were quite open about how they reached certain conclusions were able to survive with enhanced reputation and professional respect. Those who did not might survive because of tenure, but could rarely win an argument on trust;

6. The plan or proposal itself has the opportunity of evolving through the phases not only as an increasingly complex and detailed guide to subsequent action but as an increasingly acceptable political, educational and resource package. Consequently, the model is one which facilitates close attention to task and process concurrently - one of the perpetual problems of organisational theorists, and practitioners.

What can we learn from the application of this model to the declining enrolment situation in Salt Lake City?

1. There were three quite distinct periods in the case, which correlate very closely with the three superintendents of schools in office during the decade in question. Period 1 was fairly quite and operated largely at a bureaucratic Phase 4. Period 2 was marked by frenetic activity; inconsistency; lack of stability; continuous movement between the four phases; a low level of policy implementation and a high level of conflict. Period 3 was characterised by steady progression from one phase to the other, controlled conflict, and the delivery of implemented policies at the end. On the surface, therefore, it would appear that Period 2 was a disaster area, and Period 3 particularly successful. Let us briefly analyse each period more closely and identify some significant lessons ...

2. Period 1 was tenanted by School District Superintendent 1 (SDS 1) on the verge of retirement, and a highly trusted and eminent local figure. The decline in enrolments of inner city schools, in progressively bad shape, led to him taking informed soundings with the School Board and other influential community figures. On being assumed there was unlikely to be any protest, the closures of schools were effected just before his retirement with no community 'flak'.

3. Period 2 was the outcome of the administration of SDS 2, who had been deputy SDS for four years and unanimously

appointed SDS 2. He adopted an appraoch characterised by:

- a Grand Strategy based on educational improvement and financial viability and a belief in 'objective' analyses - his;

- public pronouncements of intent prior to acceptance of policy by the Board of Education;

- administrative preparations for school closures prior to Board acceptance;

- an insensitivity to pressure groups and dislike of negotiations and two-way communications;

- poor union relations;

- a tendency to use Master Plans as philosophical statements of the desirable rather than phased intentions;

- closures which were deemed to be financially necessary, but were somewhat ad hoc, uncoordinated, unsupported and highly contentious.

4. Period 3 commenced with the 'resignation' of SDS 2 and the external appointment of SDS 3. His approach may be typified as comprising:

   - a good balance between 'task' and 'process' orientations to the issue, and a determination to produce a good and acceptable policy;

   - a strong realisation of the pain caused to communities by closure of schools, but a realisation that such pain is less than that of having inadequate funds spread thinly over too many buildings. Seventeen schools were closed as a result of the strategy developed;

   - a realisation that community conflict is born out of fear of the unknown, and insecurity rather than natural

'bolshevism', and can be controlled by open administration working to a clear process and to a firm timetable.

- a natural ability to work openly with all types of interest groups to achieve their confidence and trust;

- extensive use of information surveys and research on impacts of policy to help create a mood of objectivity, trust, reasonableness and sustained monitoring;

- the ability to develop bargains with interest groups to secure their commitment to a contraction policy based on quality improvement, and consequently, a broad policy consensus.

The particular devices used within the phases of the model include:

- the development of 'climatic policies' first designed to secure the general commitment, goodwill and trust of groups and which created an environment in which groups would willingly and openly talk with each other and with the administration about declining enrolment policies;

- the use of citizens committees (the School Building Needs Council) with wide representation, to study the problem and make recommendations to the Board (Phase 2);

- the use of local and external consultants; demographic and community surveys; and staff personnel as influences on the public debates (Phase 2);

- the use of public meetings to discuss the SBNC Report to develop and test tentative strategic solutions and to receive information (Phase 2/3);

- extensive use of the media to give and receive information and test solutions (Phase 3);

- development and testing of detailed strategic policy and

sub-policies with all relevant interest groups in whatever arenas were relevant. Modification of policies and sub-policies if necessary, and development of acceptable alternatives were common (Phase 3);

- presentation of final solutions at general public meetings and taking official action at Board meeting (Phase 3);

- swift implementation of overall policy by the administration (Phase 4), especially relating to setting up public hearings on specific school candidates for closure, and given a closure decision, speedy termination of the school and disposal of its human and physical assets.

5. It is hoped that the implications of this are fairly obvious in terms of what constitutes an effective policy formation process, and what, indeed, constitutes an ineffective process. The applicable criteria seem to be 'closure of relevant excess schools with minimum social conflict, leading to a better educational system and a healthy financial bank balance'. It should not be inferred that the author's analysis is leading him to an advocacy of political manipulation unfettered by fact and analysis. One of the impressive features of this school district of late, and others in the USA, has been the existence of a parallel logistic analysis of high quality; this is necessary to ensure that accurate information is fed in at the right points, including:

   (a) detailed data bases on demographics, localities, staff, facilities, finance and educational programmes;

   (b) guidelines on alternative options to help resolve identified problems (e.g. excess school capacity);

   (c) published decision criteria (e.g. for school closures) and performance standards.

The significant recognition of Period 3 is that policies (whether they be climatic, strategic or supportive) have to

be logically and educationally defensible as viable solutions to the problem, and politically acceptable to the wide range of interested parties involved.

References

Abramowitz, S. and S. Rosenfeld (eds) (1978) Declining Enrolments: the Challenge of the Coming Decade. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Andree, R.G. (1971), The Art of Negotiation. Heath Lexington.

Davies J.L. (1979) "Corporate management and the education service: reflections on the political dimensions", Journal of Educational Administration, vol.17, no.2.

Enderud, H.G. (1977), Four Faces of Leadership in an Academic Organisation. Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag, Arnold Busck.

March, J.G. and J.P. Olsen (1976), Ambiguity and Choice in Organisations. Bergen: Universitets for laget.

PLANNING RURAL PRIMARY EDUCATION IN THE FACE OF FALLING ROLLS

David Falcon

Senior Assistant Director of Education
Humberside County Council

Mr Falcon presented a paper of this title to the Conference. However, there is no paper available for publication in this volume. What follows therefore is an abstract of the presentation which he made.

Humberside Education Authority has conducted a consultative exercise regarding the future of primary education in an area currently served by three small schools. The consultations have involved teachers, ancillary staff, managers, parents, and other interested parties; and have sought to establish a development plan for the area which would resolve the various, and often conflicting, objectives. The general demographic facts, together with information on the buildings used by the three schools and an indication of the general issues facing modern primary education, were presented to the initial consultative meeting and gradually a plan emerged which has now been adopted by the Education Committee. The form of the school that will be established is unusual in that it will be a single school operating in three separate buildings some distance apart. The presentation to the Conference focussed not only upon the educational issues of organising such a federal school, but also upon the participative nature of the planning exercises.

THE RISING COSTS OF FALLING ROLLS

T.M. Hinds

Senior Education Officer
Berkshire County Council

My purpose in this paper is to suggest some practical steps which Local Education Authorities can take to identify the rate at which unit costs are likely to increase as premises are more and more under-occupied. A brief introduction will be followed by data drawn from one LEA's study of some costs, that may provoke thought, imitation and refinement. I hope LEAs will pool their findings, to their mutual enlightenment.

Having listed 'Educational Factors', Circular 5/77 indicated the range of 'Economic Factors':

(a) Unit teaching costs per child;

(b) Unit non-teaching costs, other than premises, per child (compared with those of other schools within the authority);

(c) Unit premises cost per child (compared with those of other schools within the authority);

(d) The effect on transport costs;

(e) The potential of the premises for educational or other purposes.

I suggest that each of these factors should be studied by LEAs in their own circumstances, as factors in the evaluation of schools. This should be on a regular basis, not simply where there is the consideration of closure or reorganisation. Expenditure directly incurred in the schools can be grouped in most revenue estimates for convenience as:

(a) Teaching staff;

(b) Non-teaching staff;

(c) Premises;

(d) Supplies and services;
(e) Transport;
(f) Establishment and miscellaneous expenses.

Data derived under these headings can readily yield information for each of the factors listed in Circular 5/77.

These wide unit costs must be interpreted with caution, as the DES's Statistical Bulletin 1/79 on non-teaching costs, spells out. In particular, a variation in unit costs between similar schools does not necessarily relate to an equivalent variation in the quality of education provided in the schools; unit costs are essentially a measure related to levels of provision. However, there is some relationship between trends of costs and trends in the quality of education. Although the connections cannot be demonstrated, the noting of coincidences (for example, the higher unit costs and of a stable experienced staff) seems legitimate and relevant as one factor in the overall assessment of a school's educational health. If one incorporates a common price base in order to follow the development of the same schoo, for example over three years; then if pupil numbers are constant, a change in unit costs will probably relate to a change in standards, not merely standards of provision; likewise if standards of quality and of provision are constant, a change in pupil numbers will probably relate to a change in unit costs. It is this latter relationship that is relevant to a period of falling rolls.

I suggest that it is important to remember the proportions one to another of different kinds of costs. The following example, based on national figures, may be paralleled by each LEA (whatever the level of its expenditure, generous or cautious) - see Table 1. LEAs might find analyses of their own patterns to be provocative of further enquiry, some of which might lead to suggestions for adjustments.

Table 1. Proportions of Costs of Institutions

Schools			Evening	Colleges		Polytechnics	
Prim. %	Second. %		Institutes %	NAFE %	AFE %	NAFE %	AFE %
70	69	Teaching Staff	65	57	57	49	49
13	11	Non-Teaching Staff	16	20	20	25	25
12	12	Premises	12	9	9	11	11
4	5	Supplies & Services	4	9	9	10	10
1	1	Establishment Expenses	3	5	5	5	5

NB: Transport has been omitted because compulsory provision and inevitable distances make a comparison unhelpful.

In one LEA detailed analysis of costs and numbers were made on twenty-four secondary and primary schools in two areas where the pattern of forecast population changes in the next decade was similar to the pattern for the LEA as a whole. The results are summarized in Table 2 following.

In providing the ground for questions lies the main value of these unit costs

For example: why is it that one grammar school with substantial numbers of sixth form pupils is visibly expensive in teaching unit costs (School B, column 2), while the other grammar school is not? (School D).

For example: Would one expect to identify First Schools (5-8), Middle Schools (8-12), and Combined Schools (5-12) by different orders of costs? The data does not bear it out. Should we be spending more on 11 year olds than 6 year olds? If not, why do we spend so much more on the 15 year olds?

For example: Why is it that schools with the same number of pupils (e.g. K and M, L and R) have such different patterns of expenditure?

Table 2. School Cost Data from Schools in One LEA

1 School	Pupils	2 Teaching Staff £	3 Non-Teaching Staff £	4 Premises and Fixed Plant £	5 Supplies and Services £	6 Transport £	7 TOTAL in Schools Revenue £
A Secondary	729	311.9	26.8	32.7	29.1	25.2	428.5
B	730	338.8	38.0	38.9	21.6	40.3	480.0
C	460	297.7	37.0	62.8	27.7	3.7	433.5
D	811	312.0	39.0	50.3	26.4	38.1	470.0
E	514	313.6	38.1	39.3	27.0	3.7	423.6
F Primary	347	189.9	27.6	31.0	11.6	-	261.7
G	235	205.8	36.8	19.7	11.2	-	275.1
H	276	208.2	25.5	27.3	11.5	2.8	276.9
I	246	186.4	32.6	23.4	10.0	2.1	256.1
J	131	231.4	52.3	21.2	11.2	28.7	346.4
K	22	453.4	143.2	35.5	15.9	-	649.6
L	250	221.6	49.4	28.9	11.4	6.0	318.9
M	22	363.3	82.4	16.6	15.9	-	479.8
N	265	226.2	29.9	17.9	11.6	-	287.2
O	205	194.8	38.1	27.3	10.6	-	272.4
P	204	196.4	32.5	69.3	11.5	-	311.5
Q	190	207.9	49.4	71.8	10.5	-	341.2
R	252	201.2	23.3	28.2	10.5	-	265.5

For example: Would it be sensible in planning reorganisations to consider the closure of schools built in the early 1970s which have limited space per pupil compared with some schools of the 1950s and 1960s, and which have high debt charges, because the debt charges are a reducible cost if the building and the site are disposed of as of no further use?

The pupil numbers for the schools were forecast for ten years ahead, including a very detailed street by street analysis of under-fives, showing three schools with increasing rolls and 21 with falling rolls. In moving on to consider the cost implications of these changes, it was necessary to build in the major factors of 'fixed and variable costs': for a discussion of these concepts, see the paper "The economics of small schools: some conceptual issues" by Tim Simkins, in this volume.

Experience over many years suggests that these fixed and variable costs may be apportioned among expenditure headings as in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Apportionment of Fixed and Variable Costs

Fixed %		Variable %
5	Teaching Staff	95
80	Non-teaching Staff	20
100	Premises	0
0	Supplies and Services	100
0	Transport	100
50	Establishment Expenses	50

On these, or similar apportionments, from any given actual base of pupil numbers and unit costs, projections can be made of the order of change that can be expected in unit costs as pupil numbers change. The formula may not be exact, nor suited to the needs of each LEA, but the use of a formula

produces illuminating suggestions. I suggest that LEAs may find it useful to use such apportionments in forecasting the scale of cost changes that lie ahead for their schools and colleges.

The consequence in the study was the clear evidence that although total costs might be expected to reduce in the schools, unit costs would increase: i.e., actual costs would not change pro rata with pupil numbers. For the eighteen schools listed in Table 2, the percentage changes in pupil numbers and in unit costs were forecast as in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Forecast Changes in Pupil Numbers and Unit Costs

School	Pupils	Unit Costs	School	Pupils	Unit Costs
A Secondary	-42%	+12%	J Primary	+29%	- 5%
B	-26%	+ 6%	K	+ 9%	- 2%
C	-21%	+ 7%	L	-20%	+ 7%
D	- 5%	+ 1%	M	+23%	- 3%
E	-20%	+ 5%	N	-45%	+18%
F Primary	-25%	+ 8%	O	-45%	+22%
G	-11%	+ 6%	P	-19%	+ 8%
H	-18%	+ 4%	Q	-29%	+19%
I	-23%	+ 7%	R	-49%	+22%

From this small exercise one might suggest that in percentage terms unit costs will increase at half the rate of the falling roll, and that non-teaching costs will increase at the same rate as the falling roll.

FALLING ROLLS, INSET AND THE PROFESSIONAL CENTRE

Michael Matthews

Deputy Head
Sir Leo Schultz School
Hull

Early effects of falling rolls on teachers are seen in their career patterns. Promotion opportunities are fewer and mobility is reduced. Not only are there fewer openings in total, but some LEAs are only advertising locally, and so the available field is reduced also. There are fewer new schools built, less growth in group point score and fewer points becoming available; indeed some schools build up 'point debts' as they decline. The affect of all this on personnel accustomed to rapid promotion or recruited during the recent period of rapid expansion of training places is profound and takes two major forms: either a lowering of morale and a growing indifference, or an increased awareness of the competition and a desire to increase personal marketability by additional qualifications and/or experience. There is a turning to the INSET programme for help.

Two other effects of falling rolls also make demands on INSET provision: the general squeeze on the curriculum which makes subject innovation difficult and even threatens minority areas already included; and the argument that teachers hitherto regarded as specialists will need to teach a second subject.

Simultaneously, school heads as managers of organisations are also turning to the INSET programme for help in dealing with the problems as seen from their viewpoint: declining

staff morale, inflexible organisation structures, the need to develop new skills in specialist teachers.

But falling rolls have not hit schools alone. The first sector to face the problem was teacher education. Although this county fared better than some areas in the cuts in initial training provision, the figures for the public sector are as follows:

1975-76: 1,545 initial teacher training places;

1976-79: notional 600 places, including 22.2% in-service: although the actual number was nearer 400.

This decline in teacher education provision together with a general shortfall in the student recruitment to higher education, has resulted in a surplus of staff within the public sector higher education institutions. Thus an increase in demand for INSET from both schools and teachers coincides with increased availability of teacher education resources.

The Professional Centre

The James Report (DES, 1972) had written of professional centres (with reference to the McNair Report) as a forum for the exchange of ideas, information and experience "between new and experienced teachers, teacher-trainers and LEA advisers", and as "a point of reference independent of the school and their (teacher) employers". In November 1977 the Director of Education of the county referred to above issued a discussion document rec-mmending the establishment of a professional centre based on the local College of Higher Educatio which itself had been established in 1976 from the merging of six previously autonomous institutions (two colleges of education, and colleges of art, commerce, natuical studies and technology).

The Authority already had a senior adviser responsible for in-service training; education centres staffed by full-time wardens in three of its towns; and a few smaller centres open on a part-time basis. The University Institute of Education

offers a programme of in-service courses and various subject associations, curriculum study groups; and individual schools have their own arrangements. The major co-ordinating role is entrusted to the County Consultative Committee on In-Service Training.

Against this background the Professional Centre was established to "weld the expertise of the College with that of the Advisory Service" and to "meet the express needs of ... teachers".

The Centre was intended to draw upon the staff and facilities of the entire College - not merely those of the School of Teacher Education - and was thus seen as a major new star in the in-service firmament. Also there was to be a full-time annual secondment of a teacher from the Authority's service to the Centre (it should be noted that simultaneously a scheme for six-week full-time secondments of teachers to the Education Centre was launched). It was necessary to allay the fears of those already operating in the field that this was not a massive new competitor but a partner in what was seen at the time tobe a significant expansion of in-service education. The ACSTT booklet Making INSET Work (1978) talked of INSET as being "at take-off point" and in fact the target date for 3% of the national teaching force being on secondment at any one time remains - though unrealistically - at 1981. Consequently the Steering Committee (later the Policy Committee) of the Professional Centre was composed of representatives of teachers, education centre wardens, LEA advisers, LEA administrators and College staff. The University and HMI were invited to send representatives.

Besides mounting courses and conferences, the Centre was also to offer research and advisory services. The last of these (labelled 'consultancy' within the College and 'school-focussed' activities within the schools) proved to be particularly promising and should be capable of significant expansion.

Problems Within the College of Higher Education

The establishment of the College of Higher Education coincided with the decline in student numbers in initial training. In order to weld the six colleges into a whole the old organisation was altered, and this resulted in a confusing picture. The School of Teacher Education was placed in a faculty that included Combined Studies, Community Education and (later) Social Studies. Principal lecturers in charge of 'subjects' sometimes lost their staff who might now be spread across two or three Schools. Of four heads of department in the old colleges, one retained control of the new School, though the others retained their rank. Two new levels were introduced: dean of the faculty and subject chairman. The first was in hierarchical authority over the heads of schools and the second was a selected member of staff (often not the most senior in the subject grouping) responsible for organising the subject staff irrespective of the School to which they were attached, and having direct access to the Dean and even the College Director. Thus there was a tendency for the old status positions to lose power and for new status positions to emerge. Alongside this, those staff designated 'course tutors', responsible for guiding new courses through validation procedures and having contact with the CNAA, external examiners, etc., also achieved status as they were the ones bringing in students. The effect of this status shift tended to create a body of staff dissatisfied with the new regime and suspicious of its motives and values.

Thus the new confusing 'matrix' form of organisation tended to exacerbate the air of despondency and by low morale resulting from the severe fall in student numbers.

The need to increase the 'full-time equivalent' students (FTEs) is a constant concern of the College management and much effort has gone into making staff aware of the figures. Schools are instructed to present their development plans in terms of FTEs, and staffing levels are based on these. There is a danger in this system of 'payment by

results' that viewpoints will become narrower and more immediate and the quick dividend of increased numbers in the short term might prove expensive in the long term, if the necessary investment (course development in the light of future demand) is not made. In other words, the temptation needs to be avoided of relying on further certificate in education courses instead of developing new forms of B.Ed. courses, of holding massive day conferences instead of intense but small in-service courses.

Another result of reorganisation and falling enrolments is a loss of confidence. Some staff feel as if their old expertise is no longer valued and that they are being pushed into positions they may find untenable. This feeling is perhaps heightened by the support given to the Professional Centre by the College's top management (i.e. above Head of School level) and by the full-time secondment to the College of a high-ranking teacher (deputy head group 11) who operates outside the College hierarchy. This weight is counterbalanced somewhat by the appointment of a part-time Director of the Professional Centre who is a senior lecturer within the College (i.e. not very high in the College hierarchy, especially when viewed from the bases of the old colleges of education). It is possible therefore for the reluctant to hide within the complex organisational levels of the College. However, once the Professional Centre is seen to 'bring in the goods' in the form of teachers present in the College, and thereby recognising that the College staff have a valued expertize, this may well change. There is an understandable desire among some staff, having been involved in the old colleges of education which have now sunk from sight, only to be associated with success. Once the more enterprising make it work, then others may happily join.

One problem that is causing much trouble is that of costing. The Head of the School of Teacher Education is anxious to fulfil his part of the 2/9 formula. The School has since 1978 been operating a three-year part-time B.Ed., two full-time courses in special education, a full-time nursery conversion course and a part-time further education teaching certificate course. The costing problem initially arose with the B.Ed.

which would, on full stream, cater for at least 180 part-time students (with DES approval for another 90) on two sites, one of which necessitates three to four hours travelling time for staff; the course is taught entirely in evenings and week-ends. Though CNAA recommends a figure of at least 0.5 FTE for the students on the course, the College divisor comes up with one of 0.29. This has the effect of reducing the prestige of the course and with it the morale of the staff. With the threat of this divisor being used for all in-service courses in education, the intensive short course (say 30 course members for 35 hours over five days), which is very demanding on the organisational and teaching skills of staff who are teaching 'normally' as well, becomes unattractive.

Nevertheless, the Centre is functioning. Within its first few months courses and conferences have been held, advisory services have been called upon and a research programme is planned.

The Professional Centre therefore is viewed with mixed feelings. On the one hand it is an exciting new venture based on the recognised expertise of the College staff and designed to bring teachers and trainers together in a mutually benefiting partnership, enhancing both the College's enrolment and its prestige. On the other hand, it is seen as an intrusion by the LEA, making further demands in a time of threat, confusion and disorientation.

Whether the Professional Centre will in fact become the 'weld' between the College and the Advisory Service, or the final straw remains to be seen. The first seven months of its existence, characterised as they have been by discussion and negotiation, together with imminent financial economies, suggest that the Centre will succeed. The proposed £2,400,000 cut-back in education in the County - with presumably more to come - will inevitably hit in-service budgets. The Advisory Service may turn to the College for more help when out-county courses and imported talent prove too expensive.

That there is much expertise within the College is undeniable. It is to be hoped that the problems can be seen in perspective and tackled with goodwill.

Reference

DES (1972), Teacher Education and Training. HMSO (The James Report).

DECLINING ROLLS: SOME MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Roger H. Mercer

Principal Lecturer
Department of Education Management
Sheffield City Polytechnic

One can distinguish, in principle at least if not always in practice, five analytically distinct phases in organizational life, each of which has its own management problems and appropriate management styles.

1. Managing the design and setting up of an organization;
2. Managing expansion;
3. Managing within a predictable organizational framework;
4. Managing cutback;
5. Managing a close-down.

These five stages can be considered as sequential and often are so. However, in conditions of decline, retreat and turbulence they are likely to be confused, mixed up and unclear. Put more vividly, Newsam (1978) uses two images to highlight the difference between expansion and contraction: building a wall brick by brick, and emptying a bucket of water thimblefull by thimblefull.

Another distinction which appears to be pertinent in times of contraction comes from the management literature and refers to the technical and administrative cores of management activity. An insightful American study on innovation uses these categories to distinguish between the effects of top-down and bottom-up change (Daft and Becker, 1978). The technical core relates to the educational, curricular and teaching skills

of teachers, while the administrative core relates to administrative actions, decisions and activities of school principals and school board superintendents. In this country, Whiting (1977, p.68) when faced with the closure of a college of education found that it made sense to make a similar distinction between the prime task of the college (i.e., its educational purposes with regard to quality of teaching, curriculum and educational provision for students) and on the other hand contraction management (i.e., questions to do with retraining, redeployment, redundancy and dismissal of staff, and arrangements for disposal and handing over of buildings and equipment).

Some Strategic Issues: Planning

Ozbekham (1968) identifies various planning levels:

- normative (what should be done);
- strategic (what can be done);
- operational (what will be done);

which provide a useful framework for thinking about contraction management and for managing closure. Zeiler (1974) suggests that there are three kinds of strategies one can adopt in the face of a prospect such as falling rolls in secondary schools.

(a) Reactive problem solving. Here you do nothing about the problem until it besets you. This strategy means a narrowing of the options available.

(b) Trend modification. This is a future-oriented version of (a) above, where present trends are projected, future problems and needs foreseen, and suggested policies and mechanisms are devised which avoid or ease predicted furure problems.

(c) Goal oriented planning. Here one decides on desired future goals and implements policies to 'guide' the system towards them. An acceptance of 'organised anarchy' may be a prerequisite of this mode of working.

Commonsense suggests that cutback, contraction and possible closure need to be planned while there is sufficient time to think through issues and to make preparations - even though precise scenarios and timing will at that stage be unknown. Planning in such circumstances is likely to be qualitatively different from the planning we know when the frameworks and parameters are known and well established. Paradoxically, flexibly and adaptability will be at a premium and need to be combined with sense of purpose and a drive for continued and increasing effectiveness.

Changing the School

Political and financial decisions made by central and local government to cut back resources available to education in the light of declining rolls will have direct and knock-on effects on individual schools. There will be a tendency to centralise decisions and power, and this will be experienced as a loss of some of the autonomy that individual schools traditionally have experienced. I take it as axiomatic that organisational structures within individual schools (and even within a given LEA area) to be subservient to educational purposes. Hence, if organisational structures have have outlined their educational usefulness I would see no *prima facie* argument why outdated structures should not be replaced. Hedberg (1976) suggests that in conditions of uncertainty when adaptability is at a premium what he calls temporary 'organisational tents' are preferable to 'hierarchical palaces', while Weik (1976) suggests that in similar circumstances loosely coupled sub-units enable a flexible response to be made to a wide range of eventualities while maintaining operational effectiveness. Translated into school terms this might mean a move away from present organisational arrangements and a move towards flatter organisational structures. It would also mean the development of a variety of temporary task groups, ad hoc groups, working parties and teaching teams to carry out the planning, and working through of projected core educational activities in the light of

reduced numbers of pupils and staff.

Stocktaking

Stocktaking is a strategic activity that can be undertaken by a secondary headteacher in planning to deal with declining rolls and possible reorganisation or closure of the school at some unspecified date in the future. In my view such an activity could involve the following, probably carried out over a period of months or even years:

(a) An organisational inventory. What jobs need to be done? When? How? Do such jobs have a 'shadow' person? Are these jobs rotated, and who has experience of doing them? Such an inventory will be invaluable when remaining staff have to take on new roles in the organisation, possibly at short notice.

(b) Identification of minimum viable school size and age range. This would also imply the identification of the minimum viable core curriculum and the minimum number of teachers who would be required to teach such a curriculum. The development of this minimum curriculum would require considerable consultation and time, and could lead to identification of a core team of teachers, to the identification of training needs, and to the inception of a school development plan.

(c) Identification of arrangements for monitoring:
   i. educational effectiveness
   ii. the effectiveness, humaneness and supportiveness of the arrangements for the run-down of the organization.

(d) Inventory of physical plant, stock, etc; for example, teaching and non-teaching staff skills, staff resources and political contacts, local and national political support, and support from 'influentials', parents, etc.

(e) Inventory of training needs of teaching and non-teaching staff in respect to the needs of the school (the minimum

viable core curriculum, the school development plan, etc.) and in respect to needs of the individual (being better qualified to work in the smaller school of the future, or to find employment elsewhere).

The activity of stocktaking and of lising raises questions, provokes consultation and prepares the way for priority setting, even if the ordering is no more finely tuned than 'more important', 'less important'.

Training

It can be argued, with some truth, that in periods of contraction explicit priority setting in the allocation of scarce resources is more important than at other times. Morris (1975), however, argues for the development of managerial resourcefulness. He identifies seven qualities which seem to be significant since all of them can be improved by selective experience:

* flexible intelligence;
* technical abilities;
* social abilities;
* emotional resilience;
* drive for continued effectiveness;
* effective judgement in conditions of uncertainty;
* commitment to fundamental values.

Such qualities are useful at any time but may become crucial in times of cutback. Similarly, providing and taking opportunities for teachers (and headteachers) to continue learning are useful at any time but may become crucial in times of cutback. The purposeful seeking out of new experience and opportunities, learning, training, staff development and school development are means of moving towards appropriate new goals.

Critiera for success

It is interesting to note that based on a study of over 100 schools, Dalin's test for a school's success (Dalin, 1978, chapter 6) would be its creativity and its adaptability.

His checklist for creativity is as follows:

* Individuals within the institution are conscious of their own needs for renewal;

* Sub-groups within the institution have expressed needs for changes which are common to other sub-groups or are in conflict with the needs of other sub-groups;

* The institution has to be able to adopt a plan for renewal and is developing motivation for institutional growth - the original innovative ideas are already undergoing change;

* The institution is developing its capacity or ability for self-development - new talents as well as alternative ideas develop;

* The institution is actually managing a self-renewal process with, or without, external help;

* The institution has an ongoing programme of self-renewal and is assessing and redesigning its own renewal programme.

And for adaptability:

* Individuals within the institution have knowledge about external innovative ideas and concerns (political, economic, social and educational);

* Individuals within the institution are motivated to implement external innovations and are actively seeking information;

* Knowledge is shared among individuals and sub-groups, and motivation to implement outside innovations is growing and developing within the institution. Since the institution is basically survival oriented a process of 'negotiation' and adaptation modifies the innovation;

* The institution is successfully managing the externally developed innovation. Alternations of the innovation and unintended effects are the norm;

* The institution has an ongoing implemented programme, is being evaluated and is willing to negotiate, re-design, and change its own practices according to external demands.

The point I am stressing here is that a school's creativity is and always has been a necessary condition of its success. Creativity, however, is by no means a sufficient condition for survival. As numbers fall greater adaptability will be

required. For the head this means emphasising boundary scanning activities and other activities which focus on the educational setting and the environment. In such situations co-operative ventures, consortia and joint enterprises probably will develop and ought to be encouraged, and constraints viewed as opportunities.

Conclusions: Towards a self-renewing school

I have suggested in this paper that in facing declining rolls we need to couple flexibility with a sense of purpose and with continued and increasing educational effectiveness. I leave the final word with Hedbert (1976) who writes:

> Long term viability maximises in a self-designing organisation in which those who perform activities take primary responsibility for learning and for inventing new methods, and in which non-participant designers restrict themselves to a catalytic role ... Serious future problems can be avoided by keeping processes dynamically balanced. The desired balance can be caricatured with six aphorisms:
>
> Co-operation requires minimal consensus;
> Satisfaction rests upon minimal contentment;
> Wealth arises from minimal affluence;
> Goals merit minimal faith;
> Improvement depends on minimal consistency;
> Wisdom demands minimal rationality.

References

Daft, R.L. and S.W. Becker (1978), Innovation in Organizations: Innovation Adoption in School Organizations. Elsevier.

Dalin, P. (1978), Limits to Educational Change. MacMillan.

Hedberg, B.L.T. et al (1976), "Camping on the seesaws: prescriptions for a self designing organisation," Administrative Science Quarterly, vol.21, no.1, pp.1-65.

Morris, J. (1975), "Developing resourceful managers", in B. Taylor and G.L. Lippett (eds), Management Development Training Handbook. McGraw-Hill.

Newsam, P. (1978), The Consequences of Falling School Enrolments: an Education Officer's View. Sheffield City Polytechnic, Department of Education Management (Sheffield Papers in Education Management, No. 1)

Ozbekham, H. (1968), "The triumph of technology: 'can' implies 'ought'," in S. Anderson, Planning for Diversity and Choice. M.I.T. Press.

Weik, K.E. (1976), "Educational organisations as loosely coupled systems," Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 21, no. 1, pp.1-19.

Whiting, N.E. (1977), Management in a Period of Change and Closure: a Case in Teacher Education. Unpublished MSc in Education Management project report, Sheffield City Polytechnic.

Zieler, W.L. (1974), "Planning in action: techniques of inventive planning workshops", in Participative Planning in Education. OECD, pp.344-380.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONSORTIA FOR 16+ PROVISION IN THE FACE OF FALLING ENROLMENTS

Jennifer A. Mundy

Principal Lecturer in Education Management

and

Michael J. Elliott

Research Assistant in Education Management
Sheffield City Polytechnic

This paper highlights the problems for schools in providing education at 16+ in the face of falling enrolments and dwindling resources. It then examines the difficulties schools will have to resolve if they (or their LEAs) choose to solve these problems by co-operating in a consortium. Links between school and school, and school and FE college are often described through the perceptions of students (King, Moor and Mundy, 1977; 1975), by emphasizing the different pastoral and academic ethos of the different institutions, i.e. the work looks at the effects of co-operation. Preliminary work in the USA on the co-operation of institutions of higher education (Lang, 1975; Fox, 1978) has focussed instead on the managerial aspects of such consortia as does the research currently being undertaken at Sheffield City Polytechnic

The fall in the birthrate is now hitting primary schools, but secondary schools are still coping with large numbers. In Sheffield, for example, the fifth year population for 1979-80 is estimated at just over 9,000, and, after peaking in 1980-81, numbers are expected to be 8,500 in 1985-86. The drop in sixth form numbers will start affecting the schools in the mid-eighties so that whereas Sheffield schools had 3,356 sixth form pupils in 1977-78, it is

estimated that by the late 1980s there will be 2,298. (These numbers of course do not include students who go to further education colleges). It may be that numbers staying on in full-time education will increase because of the poor employment prospects for young school leavers and the possibility that MSC and YOP courses will be cut back. However, the increase cannot be certain as potential sixth-formers may be deterred by cuts in maintenance grants where these currently apply. Sheffield figures are echoed elsewhere in the country. Schools in North London suggest an even more dramatic cut (Davies, 1979).

The current sixth former numbers, even if they could be maintained, tend to suggest that some sixth formers may not be able to take up even a minimal range of options. Shirley Williams told the House of Commons this year that she considered a sixth form of 120 adequate and that 70 students would be an "absolute minimum" (Guardian, 1979). Such a figure is based on the number of A-levels that a sixth form should offer to cover the major academic subjects (usually put at somewhere between 12 and 15). R.N. Deale (1979) has calculated that a sixth form of 150 students should be able to offer 16 A-level subjects, 8 O-level/CSE/CEE subjects, and still have some spare capacity. However, on his calculations, a sixth form of 100 could only offer 11 A-level subjects (unless there were economies made by teaching upper and lower sixths together in some subjects).

Many sixth forms however do not live up to these numbers. Of the 36 schools with sixth forms in Sheffield (a city where the staying-on rate is more or less in line with the national average) 18 had sixth forms in 1977-78 of less than 70, the "absolute minimum" proposed by Shirley Williams. A DES national survey found that 60 per cent of modern language groups were running with less than five pupils (Guardian, 1979). Subjects such as music, classics, religious education, some of the sciences and many of the crafts are all in danger of dwindling away, partly because

the range of options at 14 is gradually being cut as numbers and resources fade and partly because of the cost of staffing them at sixth form level.

What then are the options for developing and maintaining a good system of sixth form education? Sixth form colleges, of where there are about 80, catering for 8 per cent of sixth formers, and tertiary colleges of which there are 14, might now seem to be an expensive luxury for LEAs considering whether they can afford the cost of converting buildings already in existence or building new premises. A-level courses in FE collegeshave been criticized by John Sayer, Head of Banbury School, as the most expensive option which would seem to point 16+ students back to school. Small sixth forms may be developed successfully at a certain cost to the lower school by enhancing staffing ratios, or to the cost of sixth form by cutting down on teaching periods and doubling up of year groups. One further option, at present little used, and then not always used successfully, is that of sharing sixth form provision among a group of schools, or schools and an FE college. About 60 LEAs are working various systems of co-operation but so far these schools affect small numbers of sixth formers. The arrangements vary considerably from formal, detailed co-operation to informal ad hoc plans made at the last minute over the telephone. The research in Sheffield is examining the way in which the successful management of such co-operative ventures evolves and can best be developed.

Up until the last year or so the motivation for making the operation of 'consortia' really effective has been fairly low for the following reasons:

(a) Headteachers have traditionally been rather jealous of their sixth forms;
(b) Slowly expanding sixth forms have often made it possible to 'go it alone' and gradually

establish a range of A-level subjects;

(c) Sixth form teaching has sometimes been maintained at the expense of larger groups below fifth form level.

Where co-operation has taken place it has often been in the spirit of partial commitment, waiting until one's sixth form numbers are strong enough to justify a separate group, and then withdrawing. Cuts and dwindling numbers in the lower secondary forms make it difficult to maintain this position and more schools, and LEAs, are turning to the establishment of consortia.

The immediate practical considerations for some of these consortia have been, for example, those connected with transport and helping students to settle in a new environment. These concerns are understandable but if schools concentrate their efforts only on immediate issues they ignore the longer term relationships which have to be painstakingly built. The articles by Lang (1975) and Fox (1978) already cited, point to a number of fundamental issues. Lang stresses that some of the hopes held out for consortia may be unrealistic as they may be more expensive to develop than expected:

> Cooperation requires coordination and coordination has cost in addition to the costs of whatever service or programme is provided by the consortium .... A college or university contemplating joining a consortium, thus, should not ask how membership in the consortium will reduce existing operating costs and by how much, but whether or not the benefits provided by membership in the consortium are more useful in terms of their costs (and remember these are added costs) than benefits which would be realized by the institutions' allocating resources in some other fashion (Lang, 1975, pp.29, 31).

He also highlights the difficulties which may come when the joining up process has become irrevocable and it would cost more to get out than to stay in. Communication, difference in standards between institutions, paucity of commitment, the 'hidden' costs, the need for quick-acting

leadership all contribute to his final conclusion that the "application of the consortium concept should be undertaken with care".

Fox's thesis is that "as additional costs escalate and student populations decline, the drive for planning and co-ordination will be increased" (p.219). His account of co-operation between institutions of higher education in Northern Manitoba from 1907 onwards makes sombre reading. He concluded that the institutions involved did not clearly establish areas of co-operation, nor make a sound division of responsibilities and tended to lose sight of the whole programme while focussing on details. "Politics can create concoertia, but they cannot establish successful, co-operative programmes" (p.224). He points out that co-operation can be unwieldy, time-consuming, costly and inefficient and his final conclusion is similar to that of Lang: "Understanding the limits of co-operation is the first step to successful co-operation."

The Sheffield research has set out to chart the development of successful co-operation between institutions. We did not try to find a typical set of co-operative arrangements to examine. Instead we hypothesized that the process of co-operation goes through a series of stages, each of which has a number of characteristics. Furthermore we considered these stages to be sequential and needed to be resolved appropriately, otherwise success in the later stages would be doomed, or at least would prove very difficult. Thus, for example, institutions which pressed ahead to a contractual stage without having throught through alternatives, without thinking through administrative procedures, without an understanding of the role which each member of the consortium could play (a point especially relevant in the co-operation of institutions with varying degrees of power and resources) are sowing the seeds of future discord. Similarly those institutions which try to keep all options open and try not to commit personnel or resources ensure, and, in fact, make no contract, do make it much more difficult to ensure that satisfactory co-operation takes place.

During the last academic year in Sheffield we have visited a number of consortia, interviewing staff at various levels: head or principal, deputy head (or whoever is in charge of the administrative arrangements), heads of departments (both those involved in shared teaching and those who are not). We have also had several meetings with education officers, the chairman of the education committee and enjoyed access to working papers. In addition we have been able to observe meetings of some of the consortium working parties. The LEA in Sheffield encourages the development of consortia but has not laid down procedures or criteria. During the coming academic year we expect to visit an LEA where the education officers have taken a more centrally directive role than the Sheffield system.

As a result of our first round of field work, which was based on fairly lengthy structured interviews, we have seen that:

(a) the number of stages we originally envisiaged before the final contract to co-operate, a stage which we took to be the offering of courses to pupils, can on occasion telescope and be very short indeed;

(b) the political nature of the relationships between institutions, which we had envisaged and prepared for, became much more significant as we realized the delicacy of negotiation processes;

(c) the role of the education officers in terms of unobtrusive supportand smoothing the way was again more significant than we had at first realized;

(d) increasing awareness that future numbers in secondary schools will fall, at once increases the need to co-operate and increases risks of 'skipping' some of the important issues in the urgency to get something agreed before it is too late;

(e) differing ideologies as to the role of individual institutions can play in 16+ provision make negotiations difficult on occasion;

(f) the need for management changes inside an individual institution to enable co-operation to go ahead are seen variably by the individual institutions;

(g) one of the key factors involved was the scope of the vision of those directing individual institutions. Some heads were already thinking far ahead in terms of changes in lower secondary curricula, co-operation on standards of work, co-responsibility for counselling and tutoring;

(h) changes in 16+ provision might mean changes in other areas, such as adult and community education.

At present the number of students immediately affected by the development of consortia is small and, for the next year or two, likely to remain so. The complexities of co-operation however are considerable. We are not so pessimistic as either Lang or Fox, cited earlier, but we are beginning to identify certain factors crucial to successful consortia:

(i) the recognition that co-operation and co-ordination require changes internal to the individual institutions concerned;

(ii) the skills needed 'to consort' are highly political;

(iii) the degree of commitment to the original contract, together with the openness of the contract, are significant;

(iv) planning needs a longer time-scale for co-operation between institutions than it does in a single institution;

(v) co-operation will involve staff at all levels of the institution in more work rather than less initially.

The advent of falling numbers, the need for flexibility, suggest that consortia may provide a valuable short term arrangement or even a long term one for 16+ provision. The next two or three years provide a lead time for schools and colleges to develop the appropriate management skills for co-operation and co-ordination.

References

Davies, K. Brent (1979), The Efficiency of Educational Institutions with Special Reference to Secondary Schools. MSc dissertation, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, May 1979. pp.48-76.

Deale, R.N. (1979), "The shadow over the sixth form," Education, 8th June 1979.

Fox, James W. (1978), "The consortium in higher education: a second look," Journal of Educational Administration, vol.16, no.2, pp.219-225.

Guardian, 16th February 1979.

King, E.J., C.H. Moor and J.A. Mundy (1977), Post-Compulsory Education: the Way Ahead. Sage.

King, E.J., C.H. Moor and J.A. Mundy (1975), Post-Compulsory Education: a New Analysis in Western Europe. Sage.

Lang, Daniel W. (1975), "The consortium in higher education," Journal of Educational Administration, vol.13, no.2, pp.23-36.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS IMPLICATIONS OF CONTRACTION IN THE SCHOOLS EDUCATION SERVICE

R. Stenning

Principal Lecturer in Education Management
Anglian Regional Management Centre

This paper is based on the premise that the schools education sector is a declining industry and as such shares many of the labour relations problems associated with declining industries in the wider economy. To educational administrators, the comparison may seem inappropriate and therefore irrelevant to those engaged in the process of coping with employment issues in the education service now, and in the foreseeable future. Clearly, such comparisons present a number of conceptual and practical difficulties including the different cultures, traditions and modus operandi. Nevertheless, reference to other sectors of employment serves to challenge introspective views, and may provide some useful hints as to how education administrators may proceed to formulate and implement appopriate labour relations policies.

To provide a suitable frame of reference we might usefully begin by examining the concept of education as a declining industry. Here, the key element is the decline in school rolls. Thus, the education service is currently faced with a decrease in effective demand for the service it provides and this is likely to continue until the late 1980s. Now, such observations immediately raise a number of crucial policy issues which merit attention. Measurement of the demand for education simply on the basis of pupil numbers is arbitrary and therefore tends to obscure other facets of the demand equation. The demand for education also embraces the notion of the quality of educational provision, and the process of

improving the quality of the service may effectively utilise all the available resources. In this case the notion of the education service as a declining industry would be seriously undermined, since a key variable in the frame of reference adopted here is the surplus of resources over and above that thought necessary to maintain the service in the light of effective demand.

Theoretically, therefore, a government could choose to enhance the quality of the service and thereby maintain effective demand. However, in recent years successive governments have been persuaded that the economy could not afford the latter option and have seized on the phenomenon of declining school rolls as sufficient justification for reducing educational expenditure. In so doing they have effectively created a surplus of resources; and as a consequence, teachers and perhaps educational administrators are faced with depressed career opportunities, relatively low salary levels, and job insecurity: all of which tend to produce severe labour tensions. In addition to the impact on human resources, reductions in the level of educational expenditure inhibit capital investment and undermine the maintenance of school infra-structures. Further discussion of this point need not detain us; suffice it to say that it is the creation of surplus resources, at least at the macro level, which has prompted the attachment of the label of declining industry to the education service.

The surplus of human resources serves to provide a useful basis of comparison between the education service and a number of basic industries. It is not the intention here to embark on an extensive analysis of the all too familiar range of industries that have, and are, exhibiting structural decline as the dominant characteristic of their public image. However, a brief resumé of some common features accompanying their decline supplies a backcloth which facilitates a more specific comparative examination of the education service and the coal industry. The choice of the latter for purposes of comparison is prompted primarily by the fact that after years of decline the coal industry has experienced a reversal

in its fortunes by way of an increase in effective demand for coal. Education too, looks set for a decade of decline; but by the late 1980s will face an increase in demand for the service simply as a consequence of an upturn in pupil enrolments. Our immediate concern, however, is with identifying those features of employment which are characteristic of declining industries.

Firstly, industries undergoing structural decline are often beset with seemingly intractable labour relations problems frequently manifested in strikes and other forms of non-cooperation. Thus, shipbuilding, railway and car workers have at different times exhibited patterns of behaviour that seem calculated to hasten the demise of their respective industries. Contrary to popular belief, however, most people wish to remain gainfully employed and avoid the stigma and hardship associated with unemployment. The rapid increase over the past decade in the number of worker 'sit-ins' or factory occupations, when closure has been ordained, bears witness to this. Why is it, then, that employees in declining industries often display apparently suicidal tendencies towards their employing organisations? The reasons are clearly diverse and complex and are explored more fully in the context of the coal industry. However, it is perhaps appropriate here to indicate some possible causal factors at the root of such labour unrest.

In this connection, the response of declining industries to a continuing fall in effective demand for their products or services has been to implement programmes of rationalization. In effect, this has usually meant the closure of plants, a cut-back of services and the shedding of excess labour. Clearly, such action poses serious threats to workers' job security and their customary living standards. Workers in these industries have therefore sought to counter the threat of unemployment by engaging in a wide range of tactics designed to safeguard their future. Thus, job demarcation, overtime bans, 'work to rule' and strike action are entirely rational acts from the standpoint of workers threatened with redundancy. Such tactics obviously represent a challenge

to managerial authority, and have been close to becoming a normal aspect of the operation of declining industries, and thereby a manifestation of the 'British disease'. It is axiomatic that labour disruptions impair the efficiency, production levels and quality of service which, in turn, retards necessary investment. However, in the absence of mutual trust and accommodation between employers and employees, it is difficult to envisage a significant and long term improvement in the industrial relations of the declining industries.

The coal industry graphically illustrates the depth of the labour relations problems that are often a feature of industries undergoing the process of contraction. In the early 1960s, the demand for coal declined significantly in the face of more favourable pricing structures of competing fuel suppliers, particularly the oil industry. The Coal Board responded to the crisis by closing down numerous uneconomic coal mines and discharging thousands of miners. This process continued more or less unabated for the best part of a decade during which time the levels of new capital investment were also severely reduced. The programme of rationalization engendered widespread repercussions in the coal industry's labour relations as employees' job security was undermined and career prospects blighted. Miners' fears for their future were not reflected in the number of strikes, which actually declined compared with the strike incidence registered in the previous decade. However, productivity or output targets were rarely attained; demarcation boundaries were strictly adhered to; new technologies were often rejected; levels of absenteeism increased; and many of the relatively younger employees resigned and sought retraining and work in other sectors of employment. Sugnificantly, mine workers' wages declined relatively in the 1960s compared with other manual workers in the wider economy and this almost certainly influenced the exodus of many highly valued workers from the industry.

Thus, for nearly a decade the coal industry displayed the

classic symptoms of employee dissatisfaction frequently associated with an industry in decline. In addition to production and labour problems, the coal industry was progressively faced with the difficulties associated with an ageing workforce. In particular, the retirement of key personnel left a void in the structure of the workforce. Elegible personnel from outside the industry were not attracted in sufficient numbers to fill the vacancies. The alternative solution of upgrading internal personnel proved difficult largely because of the premature exodus from the industry of suitable candidates. The implications of appointing and promoting unsuitable staff are vast but of particular relevance here is the effect on the climate of industrial relations. Incompetence, owing to less than rigorous selection procedures almost certainly contributed to the labour relations tensions in the coal industry during the past fifteen years.

Such observations acquired added force following the increase in demand for coal in the early 1970s, and the accompanying public assurances that the industry was in a position substantially to increase the supply of coal. Reality, however, dictated a more pessimistic viewpoint, for after a decade of decline with all the attendant problems the necessary supplies of coal were not forthcoming and demand remains in excess of production levels. In hindsight this is perhaps not surprising in view of the relatively low investment in capital plant, and the deterioration in the quality and quantity of manpower in the intervening years.

The initiation of a number of huge investment projects and massive recruitment campaigns in recent years provides sufficient testimony to the Coal Board's production problems. However, the benefits to be derived from new investment will take years to come to fruition, and the brighter future of the industry has not been reflected in the level of recruitment, and the shortfall in requisite skills remains a cause for concern. Moreover, in the light of the increase in demand for coal and the subsequent investment and recruitment policies, the

National Union of Mineworkers clearly recognise their renewed bargaining strength. Indeed, the mine workers' national strike in 1973 has become a cause célèbre in the annals of trade union disputes. The three-day working week was a direct consequence of the miners' strike and this subsequently led to the downfall of the Heath administration. In spite of successive wage concessions and the reintroduction of incentive schemes since 1973, a spirit of labour unrest continues to pervade the coal industry and production remains below the required level. Thus, the economic logic which dictated the operation of the coal industry during the 1960s, and the concomitant lack of attention to the management of human resources, is now effectively acting as a brake on the industry's recovery.

Now, while not seeking to draw exact parallels between the coal industry and the education service, an examination of labour relations in education over the past decade reveals broad similarities in the pattern of labour disputes in the two sectors of employment. Since the late 1960s, the characteristic informality in employment relationships in the education service, exemplified by teachers' relatively wide autonomy jurisdiction, has gradually been usurped by formal regulation accompanied by increasing teacher militancy (Stenning, 1979). Briefly, widespread labour tensions within the education service began to emerge following a series of challenges to teachers' autonomy and their associated professional status. For purposes of comparison, it is appropriate here to draw attention to the fact that while miners have never shared techers' professional aspirations, the nature of their work has traditionally ensured them a great deal of autonomy in their mode of operation. Thus, threats to their freedom to conduct their working arrangements as they saw fit, such as the introduction of new technologies, have common roots with teachers in so far as the freedom to regulate their respective affairs is subject to external challenge. Such commonality of aims acquires greater significance when the security of their jobs is in doubt and when they are striving to maintain and enhance relative salary and wage levels.

Contraction of the education service cuts right across the notion of teachers' autonomy; undermines their formal bargaining strength; and poses a direct threat to security of job tenure. During the present decade teachers increasingly have displayed their determination to maintain control over their destiny, and to this end have adopted similar tactics to those used by mine workers. Thus, in addition to strike action, 'work to rule' and non co-operation in connection with a growing number of contentious issues including meals supervision, and covering sick colleagues, have become commonplace in the education service during the 1970s. In contract with the miners, however, teachers' employment contracts are relatively 'open-ended' which is a reflection of their professional status. In the current circumstances, the interpretation of teachers' contracts will increasingly become a matter of dispute. Thus, if a school sheds a number of teaching staff but the same curriculum continues to apply, there is a strong possibility that job demarcation will become a normal feature of employment relations in schools as teachers resist accepting wider curriculum responsibilities.

Some LEAs are currently refusing to fill senior vacant posts that fall vacant; implicitly if not explicitly, therefore, the administrative tasks and responsibilities will either be shared among the remaining senior staff, or they will be devolved downwards to junior staff. Given the limited career prospects, as a consequence of such policies and contraction of the service, many teachers may be expected to resist the burden of greater administrative responsibilities. Of course, some teachers will respond positively in the expectation that career advancement will follow the recognition of their capabilities. However, if their aspirations remain unfulfilled for any length of time, labour tensions may result, or they will choose to leave the education service.

In regards to obtaining alternative employment, it is often suggested that teachers' skills are non-transferable and therefore irrelevant to other fields of employment. While

the majority of teachers in the State sector of education have indicated forcefully that they wish to continue their employment within that service, there is an alternative available in the sphere of private education which has been expanding rapidly in recent years. Failure to obtain a teaching post outside the State system still leaves the possibility of retraining for other employment albeit in the present economic climate teachers would probably not find this option attractive. There are many experienced teachers, however, who have acquired managerial and administrative skills which are transferable across employment frontiers. Frustrations arising from continuing resource constraints together with limited career progression, may prompt a rise in the number of resignations of senior staff, which clearly has important implications for the operation of the education service. Policies of voluntary redundancy may reinforce the likelihood of an insupportable loss of key personnel.

The crisis confronting the education service manifest in the growing number of disputes and the adoption of some dubious employment policies, brings sharply into focus the twin horns of a dielmma which education administrators are currently grappling with. On the one horn, the government has decreed that drastic cuts in education expenditure must be put into effect within specified time limits. On the other horn, teachers are strongly opposed to such reductions in the education budget and are intent on preserving their jobs.

In this connection, the State, through its judicial arm, first recognised the legitimacy of employee 'job rights' in 1965, when the Redundancy Payments Act was placed on the Statute Book. An important principle of this legislation resided in the notion that employees have a personal investment in their work and therefore have a right to compensation in the event that the job ceases to exist. This principle has been widened under current labour legislation which is based on the belief that many industrial disputes arise because of unilateral decisions by management in dismissing employees

unfairly and otherwise acting in a discriminatory manner. Thus, under the Employment Protection (Consolidation) Act, 1978, employees are safeguarded against unfair dismissal, and discriminatory employment practices are illegal under the Equal Pay Act, 1970, and Sex Discrimination Act, 1976. Thus, indirectly at least, the State through legislative measures, has legitimised employees' attempts to preserve their job and attain equitable treatment in employment generally. In effect, the law buttresses employees' determination to defend their 'rights' in employment and it may be predicted that the existing statutes will serve to strengthen teachers' resolve to defend their jobs and advance their careers. In short, teachers will almost certainly increasingly seek protection or redress through the aegis of the law.

The primary concern thus far has been to highlight a number of employment relations problems which seem likely to arise or increase in the light of the government's existing education policies. If the education service is to avoid the type of industrial warfare often associated with declining industries, and the indications are that this is well within the bounds of possibility, then appropriate employment policies have to be devised and implemented. In the absence of specific and detailed information about LEA's wider education policies, little purpose is to be served by proposing guidelines for labour relations policies since it is extremely unwise to formulate these in a vacuum. There are, of course, some initial stages in the process of developing employment relations policies to which reference might usefully be made.

Here, the nature of demographic trends points to an early difficulty. The phenomenon of declining school rolls is not uniform across the country. In some areas there has been a marked decrease in pupil enrolments; in others, pupil numbers are relatively stable, while some have experienced a marked growth in school rolls. The reasons for such differences obviously include patterns of birth rates and migration but these need not detain us. From the standpoint

of labour relations policy formulation, the varying impact of falling school rolls underlines the problems associated with devising appropriate policies at LEA level, which are also broadly consistent throughout the country. No case is being made here for a rigid national labour relations policy; but present circumstances demand close liaison between LEAs. Differing employment policies as between LEAs is a growing source of discontent within the teaching profession, and wide variations in personnel practices - say recruitment - may lead to an escalation in the number of labour disputes as teachers insist on parity of employment opportunities and conditions generally. In the absence of coherent and broadly comparable employment policies, the government may be persuaded of the efficacy of centralised policy formulation accompanied by a rigidty which cannot respond to the dynamics of local conditions. Labour relations policies need to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate variations in the supply of teachers and pedagogic expertise.

Such requirements point to the importance of manpower planning as an integral part of the development of employment relations policies. National manpower statistics provided by the DES tend to obscure local needs since the focus is essentially a global perspective. More emphasis should be given to the systemization of manpower audits on a regular basis. Here, the basic information required includes current numbers, pedagogic expertise and ages of teachers. Acquisition of this data is an essential ingredient in the process of forward planning which, in turn, is a key element in discussions with teachers' representatives about the conduct of employment relations.

Clearly, if employment policies are to be acceptable to teachers it is vital to obtain the agreement of the teachers' unions. Labour relations policies embrace substantive and procedural issues embodied in employment contracts and collective agreements and thus provide the necessary underpinning of employer-employee relations in the education service.

While the substance of this paper may seem unduly pessimistic, the fact remains that the approach to labour relations can no longer be continued on an ad hoc basis which is a recipe for future chaos in the education service. We might therefore address ourselves to the problem of labour policy formulation in the context of LEA wider education policies.

Reference

Stenning, R. (1979), "The changing nature of employment relations in schools," Educational Administration, Summer 1979.

PRESERVING THE CURRICULUM AS ROLLS FALL

Harry Tomlinson

Headmaster
Birley High School
Manchester

Dudley Fiske (1978) in his address to the North of England Education Conference, stated:

> The first response from within the school will be pressure on authorities to provide enough teachers to sustain a basic minimum curriculum but when salaries form such a large element in the education budget this may not always be possible. The second response from the community around the school, rather than from within it, may well be to show an inclination to accept a narrow curriculum as the price of survival - for example, to eliminate all teaching of modern languages and to accept that all science teaching to 16 should be as general science .... A system of small secondary schools with a narrow curriculum may have difficulty in producing leavers with the skills and specialised knowledge that the present examination system requires, and that higher education has traditionally expected.

If there was to be a common curriculum for the period of compulsory education it would avoid the necessity for designing three-year courses which have to be both complete in themselves and the basis for a further two tear course leading to external examinations. I would suggest that a whole curriculum would be broad, whereas Mr Fiske seems to imply that the removal of some options must of necessity lead to a narrowing of the curriculum. I shall not attempt to provide such a curriculum in this short paper but examine what it should consist of, and how well current provision for Ordinary Level examinations could satisfy the needs:

Realms of Meaning

Phenix (1964) discusses six realms of meaning which cover the subjects listed:

symbolics	- ordinary language, mathematics, nondiscursive symbolic forms;
empirics	- physical science, biology, psychology, social science;
esthetics	- music, the visual arts, the arts of movement, literature;
synnoetics	- personal knowledge;
ethics	- moral knowledge;
synoptics	- history, religion, philosophy.

Hirst's areas of knowledge provide an alternative basis for analysis.

Areas of experience

H.M. Inspectorate (DES, 1977) suggest a checklist of areas of experience:

the aesthetic and creative;
the ethical;
the linguistic;
the mathematical;
the physical;
the scientific;
the social and political;
the spiritual.

Cross-curricular criteria

The Assessment of Performance Unit (1977) defines the cross-cultural criteria for desirable outcomes for a pupil after study of the normal range of curriculum subjects as:

> Language: communication through reading, writing, listening and speaking in a wide range of modes to suit the occasion, the purpose of the subject, performance in the first foreign language most commonly taught in our schools.

Mathematics: communication through numbers, graphs, models, diagrams;

Science: observation, selection, evaluation and the use of evidence, the testing of hypotheses, the use of experiments and the drawing of conclusions.

Personal and Social Development: the pupil's understanding of himself, his development as a responsible person, and his moral response to his social and physical environment.

Aesthetic Development: the pupil's appreciation of form, colour, texture, sound and material, his emotional response to his environment, his feeling for quality; and his capacity to harness imagination in creative activity.

Physical Development: the pupil's developing co-ordination, his ability to use his body effectively and expressively. This involves a range of personal skills from those needed by the child when he first starts to use a pencil to the sensitive handling of tools and instruments and the use of movement and dance in communication.

A Model School

In developing a feasability model, I shall use a school with an annual intake of 180 and a teacher-pupil ratio of 1:18: and I shall use the term lower school to refer to the first three years, and upper school to refer to the fourth and fifth years of an 11 - 16 comprehensive school.

The lower school curriculum is English - 5, Mathematics - 5, History - 5, Geography - 3, Religious Education - 2, Science - 5, Art - 2, Physical Education/Games - 3, Crafts - 4, French - 4, Social Education - 2, Music - 2; in a 40-period week, though a 20-period week would facilitate organisation.

The upper school curriculum is English - 5, Mathematics - 5, Social Education - 2, Physical Education/Games - 3, and with five options each of 5 lessons.

With 50 teachers and with a contact ratio of 0.8, with class sizes of 30 for all subjects throughout the school, except for crafts in lower school with class sizes of 20, and the options, it would be possible to offer 13 subjects in each option.

The total number of lessons available equals the number of teachers, times the contact ratio, times the number of lessons per week:

$$= 50 \times 0.8 \times 40$$
$$= 1600.$$

The number of Lower School lessons comprise:

$$3 \times \frac{(6 \times 36)}{(9 \times 4)}$$
$$= 756$$

The Upper School lessons, excluding options, comprise:

$$2 \times 6 \times 15$$
$$= 180$$

There are therefore 332 lessons available for options for each year group. With five option groups with 5 lessons per option, 13 groups would require 325 lessons. This would provide considerable choice but the lower school would only have 47.25% of the teaching time instead of the 60% to which it is entitled. The example may be exaggerated but I understand it is normal for the lower school in this situation to have less than 55% of the time in order to provide choice.

If we assume more realistic option group sizes of 18 the number of subjects which may be offered with free choice is fourteen. This degree of choice would mean the upper school would have approximately 44.7% of the total teaching time.

With an intake of 90 pupils even if the lower school only has 47.25% of the school time, it would also be possible to provide six groups in some options.

Alternative Curriculum

I would propose the following model common curriculum for consideration, with the numbers of lessons shown and the

range of subjects shown to be co-ordinated as a whole curriculum for the full five years.

English - 5

Mathematics - 5

French/Language - 5

Science (Physics, Chimeistry, Biology, Environmental Sciences - 5

Humanities (History, Geography, Religious Education, Commerce, Sociology) - 5

Design and TEchnology (Woodwork, Metalwork, Technical Drawing, Control Technology, Computer Studies) - 5

Aesthetics (Art, Music, Dance, Literature, Textiles) - 5

Physical Education - 3

Social Education (Personal, Social, Moral, Spiritual, Health, Political, Careers Education) - 2

If there were four teaching groups for each subject each year, the average class size would be 22.5. With 25 teachers allowed for 450 pupils if the teacher:pupil ratio remained at 1 : 18, and a contact ratio of 0.8, the number of lessons available would be 25 x 0.8 x 40 = 800. The number of lessons required would be 4 x 5 x 40 = 800. The bonus would be six curriculum units on a basis provision of 30 for each year, that would be 20% for each year group. It would be possible to timetable a modular course to allow three specialists to be appointed for the first 7 subject areas specified, and indeed to allow setting within each subject as required if a remedial group were defined across each year. With a physicist, a biologist and a chemist for a five year course of science for all pupils, and with the science course planned as part of a compulsory curriculum for all pupils there should be a better education than that which is now commonly provided.

Ordinary Level Examination

Science: There are Integrated Science Ordinary Level examinations such as that of the University of London, which covers the nature of matter; the behaviour of matter; forms of energy - their interconversion and conservation; and life. This could be the concluding two years of a five years course.

Humanities: The Joint Matriculation Board has recently introduced an examination in Integrated Humanities which requires the study of five of the following topics (or four and one approved for a particular centre): the community; law and order; people and work; the mass media; consumer affairs; education; the family; persecution and prejudice; poverty; war.

Design and Technology: The University of London syllabus concentrates on the design aspects:
Paper 1: statement, analysis, synthesis, realisation;
Paper 2: general, materials (wood, metal, plastics), overall and specific considerations, tools.

Technology, the application of science, would be an extension to include the most significant aspects of control technology and computer studies.

Aesthetics: So far as I am aware there is no Ordinary Level examination which covers this area of the curriculum. There have been recently several courses organised to examine the coordination of the Expressive Arts, and I would suggest that a modular course along the lines of the Associated Examination Board's Drama Ordinary Level would be successful.

The Missing Subjects: Home Economics is the main subject which apparently is missing. Southern Universities' Joint Board for School Examinations' Alternative Ordinary Level syllabus for Home Economics contains sections on The Home in the Environment; Food and Nutrition; Textiles and Clothing; and The Family. The Associated Board's Advanced Level in Domestic Science has two papers. Parer 1: Social Administration or Household Science; Home Management; Environmental Health and Hygiene. Paper 2: Food Science and Family Catering. If these areas of knowledge may reasonably be assumed to cover the subject matter of Home Economics it can be seen that a school curriculum could include all the most important aspects in Science, Humanities or Design and Technology. Without a compulsory whole

curriculum there will clearly be a wasteful unplanned overlap in subject content.

Social Education: Social Education should "unify the knowledge they have acquired in a dispersed fashion during the course of their schooling". It would be the course which would help the pupil understand his own development and the nature of the school curriculum.

Conclusion

It is not possible within the confines of a short paper to make a detailed case for such a radical change. It would leave the problem of the 11 - 18 school attempting to find sufficient pupils for Advanced Level courses unsolved, but I suspect the 11 - 18 school will become much less common in the very near future. I have ignored the problem of the second foreign language but would suggest that more time spent on the first foreign language would often be time better spent. I have examined Ordinary Level courses only. Such a curriculum would certainly make easier the transfer of pupils between schools (over 10% of my pupils moved on during the last academic year). I would propose that a compulsory common curriculum for all pupils would provide a better education than that we offer now. Improving the curriculum is a solution to the problems caused by falling rolls which requires serious consideration.

References

Assessment of Performance Unit, A.P.U.: An Introduction. Leaflet published by the D.E.S., 1977.

DES (1977), Curriculum 11 - 16: Working Papers by H.M. Inspectorate. HMSO.

Fiske, D. (1978), Falling Numbers in Secondary Schools: Problems and Possibilities. Sheffield City Polytechnic, Department of Education Management (Sheffield Papers in Education Management, No.4)

Phenix, P.H. (1964), Realms of Meaning. McGraw-Hill.

SOME ASPECTS OF MANAGEMENT WITHIN THE CLOSING SCHOOL

Norman Whiting

Warden, Peterborough Centre
Kesteven College

Institutions in Terminal Contraction

Between the decision to close an institution and the final act of closure lies a period of time, the phase of terminal contraction, characterized by an organizational and management climate very different from that which has hitherto been taken as the norm. Most of today's teachers and administrators have grown up in a climate of expansion and development in which institutional continuity and growth were taken for granted; but in a phase of terminal contraction the setting against which the institution's work must be continued is the process of closure. While it is being closed down it must be kept open.

The head of a school or college facing closure is primarily concerned with managing the institution as a provider of a service, albeit an institution which happens to be experiencing the effects of the decision on its closure. Thus there is a distinction between 'the management of closure' and 'management within a closing institution'. The school does not exist for the purpose of closing down; and a Head who makes efficient closedown his primary purpose will surely shift the locus of conflict from the periphery, where he should be containing it, to the very heart of the school.

There is therefore a source of potential and sometimes actual conflict between the interests of the closing school and those of the local authority, concerned as it

must be with wider and long-term issues. Both Head and external administrator will of course be concerned with such issues as redeployment, re-training and redundancy of staff, and with developing structures and procedures which will allow problems to be anticipated (Newsam, 1978). Nevertheless, the differences in emphasis may become differences in direction under the stressful conditions of closure, when administrative and professional imperatives will sometimes predicate incompatible goals. For even where a closure is most thoughtfully planned to ensure a minimum of dysfunction, it is nevertheless a closure.

The question then posed is this: is management in an institution in terminal contraction significantly different from management in an institution in expansion, or in development, or in a so-called steady state? An affirmative answer implies the corollary that preparation for the new management context must be undertaken. We need therefore to identify the management issues in institutions in terminal contraction and to determine the best means of preparing managers to cope with these issues. This may depend some form of action within institutions that may find themselves facing closure; it certainly requires a lead from local authorities to help the institutions to meet the new problems.

Management Issues in Educational Institutions in Terminal Contraction

Centralization and the reduction in autonomy

Colleges of education in terminal contraction experienced some loss of autonomy. Closing schools, starting from a base of more restricted autonomy, will certainly be subject to no less a reduction. More decisions will be made at LEA level, and those decisions made within the school may be influenced more directly by external controls. A school may have to share its

resources with others and engage in co-operative enterprises, both to retain a sufficient range of option subjects and to ensure the use of plant at an economic level.

As key decisions become centralized in the local authority, so within the school the Head tends to draw to himself areas of management which would be delegated in other circumstances, and routine decisions at lower level may become matters of school policy. Further, the experience of colleges of education suggests the advisability of maintaining a sound bureaucratic structure in the face of the probability of loss of staff without replacement; key organizational tasks need to be itemized and fully documented so that their redistribution among continuing staff is feasible and effective.

Curriculum Changes

It is likely that the range of curriculum options will be restricted, with a probable relative increase in emphasis on 'core' areas. Many teachers may be required to teach more than one or two subjects and will therefore need to re-equip themselves to this end. The staff development programme of the school and the in-service policy of the local authority must take account of this requirement, which also has implications for the professional aspirations of the teacher and his relationships within the school. It may post some threat to individual security and to the distribution of power within the school, though it could also hold possibilities of new forms of staff co-operation across departmental boundaries.

Staffing Issues

These may be summarised in key questions under three headings:

(a) Redeployment: what criteria will govern decisions on redeployment within the school and to other schools?

(b) Re-training: What re-training will be necessary to meet the needs of the school, and of staff wishing to move to other employment?

(c) Redundancy: how will the questions of redundancy and early retirement be approached?

Resources

As the school contracts, some reduction in material resources must be expected, particuarly through re-deployment of equipment and learning resources to other institutions which are surviving or developing. Here is a case where conflict is likely to occur: how does one decide between the claims of a closing school wishing to retain its options and quality of service in spite of declining numbers, and whose resources represent not only the material of teaching but the professional dedication, imagination and investment of the staff - and the claims of a developing school with a larger number of children, perhaps grossly under-resourced under the present financial stringencies?

Non-Curricular Organisation

Reduction in numbers may lead to changes in organisational arrangements not necessarily directly (though often indirectly) related to the teaching function of the school. Thresholds may be reached at which reductions in non-teaching staff have to be made; these may necessitate rearrangements of meals, of bus timings, of outside visits, while loss of technicians may have repercussions in practical subjects.

Communication

Conflict frequently arises from distortions in communication, which are particularly liable to occur when people are under stress. Therefore it is important that communications in all directions should flow effectively, with particular attention being paid to the points at which distortions are most likely to occur. The formal communications system may need to operate more

feequently than in less stressful circumstances in order to minimize the effect of rumour, and ease of upward communication must be ensured.

People Under Stress

Everybody is in the same boat, and it is sinking; and there is an uneven distribution of lifebelts, of swimming ability, and of the will to survive. The image is dramatic, perhaps too dramatic to describe the experience of those who weather the storm with equanimity or who may even welcome the stimulus of the enforced changes. But for many the experience is deeply troubling, and for a few it has been a trigger that has set off serious and even critical disturbance. Such has been the experience of the colleges of education during the phase of retrenchment and closures, and is no doubt similar to that of any organization in such circumstances. The intensity of emotional investment which a teacher commits to his task renders him potentially vulnerable when his job is threatened, particularly where the investment has extended to a virtual identification with the organisation or his corner of it; and his vulnerability is increased by the lack of prospect of re-building another teaching career elsewhere. The individual's ability to cope with his situation is largely a function of his temperament and personal resources, but it may be enhanced or damaged according to the quality of the support from others in the institution and in the employing Authority.

Such support may be provided formally, as through the services of the Authority's personnel department or, within the school, through the periodic appraisal interview - though this procedure has so far found little favour in schools because of its orientation towards goal achievement. The services of a staff counsellor would offer another means of support. Gray (1979) argues the case for staff counselling in educational institutions of all types, pointing out the particular pastoral needs of teachers, which became more acute under conditions of

stress. The need is less for the appointment of a specialist counsellor than for the development of what Gray (p.80) calls a "counselling mode" throughout the institution, initiated through a training programme for all staff who wish to follow it, and aiming to "move into a facilitative and caring climate of organisation".

At such a point, formal support structures merge with the informal, which are derived from personal relationships between peers, but also very strongly from the individual's perception of the attitudes of his superordinates - which emphasises the need for senior management to be seen as concerned primarily with the work of the school rather than with its closure.

Brook (1978), writing from the medical viewpoint, has identified types of individual who are particularly at risk from the stresses of organisational change. These include people in certain age groups, at critical points in a career, or who suffer loss of satisfaction consequent upon changes in their jobs, and people with personality difficulties, all of whom may be vulnerable in the circumstances of impending closure. Brook also points out organizational factors which may exacerbate stress, including the vulnerability of roles in which the expectations are conflicting or unclear. These likely sources of stress need to be anticipated and understood by those managing schools facing closure.

Conflict, Ambiguity and Uncertainty

As in any institution, the management task in a closing school is largely, in John Morris' (1975) phrase, "pulling things together". In a closing school, the manager has to keep things going while anticipating and attempting to resolve the conflict between organisational and professional imperatives, and between the interests of clients and of staff.

It helps if themanager is able to live not too uncomfortably with uncertainty and ambiguity, and to help others to do likewise (Mack, 1971). He must be able to absorb not only the usual setbacks of management, but also professionally hurtful rebuffs that may imply that he is living beyond his time; for by absorbing these himself, he protects his staff and enables them to offer their best service to the school.

Conclusion

The argument of this paper is that educational institutions in terminal contraction throw up management issues that are sufficiently distinctive in emphasis if not in kind to merit study and to justify steps to prepare those who will have to cope with the internal management of these institutions. Within a closing school there will be modifications in the management structure and relationships and changes in curriculum and in the deployment of human and material resources. There is a need for these technical problems to be identified clearly and solved in terms of what is possible and feasible in the school; but a problem defined in technical terms can be solved only in those terms. As Dahrendorf (1975, p.6) reminds us, "You can solve a problem only if you have defined it properly, and often its definition is half the solution". There remains the fact that the changes associated with impending closure have their impact on people and their aspirations, they take place in a climate of uncertainty among people under stress, and these people themselves are not passive recipients but active agents in the whole complex of events. Unless this total context is prepared for and made the matrix of the management process, the school, however excellent the technical arrangements for its demise, will die many times before its death.

References

Shaw, K.E. (1978), "Contraction and mergers of United Kingdom colleges of education: some logistic

References

Brook, A. (1978), "Coping with the stress of change at work," Management International Review, vol.18, no.3, pp.9-15.

Dahrendorf, A. (1975), The New Liberty. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Gray, H.L. (1979), "Staff counselling in education," Journal of Further and Higher Education, vol.3, no.1, pp.75-81.

Mack, R. (1971), "Management in situations of uncertainty and ambiguity," in Planning on Uncertainty: Decision-Making in Business and Government Administration. Wiley Inter-Science.

Morris, J. (1975), "Developing resourceful managers," chapter 8 in B. Taylor and G. Lippatt (eds), Management Development and Training Handbook, McGraw-Hill, pp.109-125.

Newsam, Peter (1978), The Consequences of Falling School Enrolments: an Education Officer's View. Sheffield City Polytechnic, Department of Education Management (Sheffield Papers in Education Managment, No.1)

Shaw, K.E. (1978), "Contraction and mergers of United Kingdom colleges of education: some logistic comments," Journal of Educational Administration, vol.16, no.2, pp.212-218.

MANAGEMENT AND MOTIVATION IN A CONTRACTING SECONDARY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Dudley Wright

Senior Lecturer in Education Management
Sunderland Polytechnic

It is perhaps salutary to remind ourselves that falling pupil numbers do not in themselves pose any serious threat to the quality of the education system; in almost every way their effect would, in the long term at least, be entirely beneficial. The only imperatives of falling rolls are fewer schools of present size, or the same number of smaller schools, or some convenient combination of the two, where 'size' is related solely to number of pupils on roll. Spooner (1979) welcomes falling rolls as "offering a splendid opportunity to do morethings that it has been impossible to manage in an expanding situation, things that have depended upon additional classroom space, better teaching ratios and more money per child". The pupils of ten years hence are almost certain to benefit from these 'bonuses' to some extent if only because of the 'hysteresis effect' in the control of public finance. The buildings and equipment already exist for a secondary pupil population exceeding four millions: with judicious selection of the best of these and with adequate teaching staffs it seems difficult to envisage that a better education for three million pupils would not result. In comparison it may be suggested that the major 'visible' differences between public and private sectors of education are the standards of accommodation and the quality and quantity of staff employed.

There are, however, two major obstacles to the realisation of these ideal possibilities.

(a) The Problem of Finance

The main cost element in education is teachers' salaries, and at present this is directly related to the number and age of pupils, and only by implication to the nature of the education provided. In general, the pupil-teacher ratio is the administrative regularot of teacher provision, and the school's 'unit total' (compounded from number and age of pupils) the generator of scale points, the basis of teachers' promotions and career structure. Some study and debate are currently being devoted to the feasibility of modifying the strictly linear relationship between numbers of teachers and pupils. Vut even supposing the acceptance of a 'curvilinear' PTR, the resulting formula will still provide the necessary 'administrative regulator of teacher provision' and in no way reduce the vulnerability of schools to precise control of their main cost element, and to powerful pressures from central and local treasuries to reduce overall expenditure on education pro rata the reduction in pupil numbers.

The ways in which such a rate of contraction may be achieved are not immediately clear, and in any case depend heavily upon central and local policies not yet fully determined. The constitution of the secondary teacher population and the dynamics of its regeneration are complex, but, using DES statistics (DES, 1977) the following estimates of 'inflow' and 'wastage' of teachers for 1978 are proposed.

Table 1. Estimate of Numbers of Teachers in Secondary Schools, 1978

Number in service April 1977 (provisionally published)		231,000
New entrants		+ 17,000
Re-entrants		+ 5,000
Resignations	15,000	
and retirements	2,000	- 17,000
Net increase in numbers		+ 5,000
Number in service March 1978		236,000

For probably the first time in our history we are experiencing the coincidence of a decline in numbers of pupils, an increase in the number of persons aged over 65, and an economy in a state of virtual non-growth. These circumstances generate undeniable needs and irresistable pressures to transfer public expenditure from children to old people: from the DES to the DHSS.

So the number of teachers must fall, and probably at the rate of 5,000 to 7,000 per year. The critical development for the education service is the manner in which such a rate of contraction is managed within the elements of Table 1. Will it be possible to retain a working profession, and operating schools both technically able and individually and collectively willing to exploit the 'bonuses' of the contracting system?

It has been argued that the secondary schools of the 1980s will be comprehensive schools smaller than at present. They will almost certainly have more teaching resources per pupil but will be manned by smaller teaching staffs, albeit at marginally improved PTSs. Moreover, through the decade the education service is likely to be subjected to a persistent and critical scrutiny and comment from society at large.

It follows that the salient educational problem for LEAs and headteachers in the 1980s is that of providing a first-class education in truly comprehensive schools, moving toward an average size of 4 form entry (11-18). Success fill depend upon:

- the composition, commitment and quality of a school's teaching staff;
- the mobilising of staff and pupils (and possibly also parents) around the provision of the curriculum.

(b) <u>The Problem of Promotion</u>

Spooner sees "the sharp decline in promotion prospects that a diminishing school population is likely to produce" as

"the largest fly in what I regard as a very beneficial ointment". There is a bleak prospect for teacher promotions within the existing parameters of the service: strong enough perhaps to persuade headteachers and even LEAs to include a detailed analysis of the 'constitution and dynamics of regeneration' and promotion possibilities of their own teachers within their plans for the next decade.

With a few modest assumptions it is possible to calculate with some precision, from the published data (DES, 1977, vols. 1 and 4) the opportunities for promotion among secondary teachers during the fifteen years 1977-1992. Thus for all secondary teachers, excluding middle deemed secondary,

	Scale Points
Available and distributed in 1977	247,000
Released by retirements and promotions (to Head and Deputy Head) 1977-92	99,200
Remaining distributed in 1992	149,600
Permitted by present Burhman regs. for 1992	196,000
Whence, points available for promotion, 1977-92	47,800

Thus, over the fifteen years, some 12 points for 'average' school of four form entry (11-18) are available for internal promotions and new appointments above Scale 1*.

The principal assumptions made are that the effective average retiring of all teachers throughout this period is at age 60; that the secondary sector of 1992 will contain about 4,000 schools (excluding middle schools), and that scale points released by resignations will be approximately absorbed by points awarded to re-entrants. It has also been assumed that promotions to Head and Deputy are made from existing Senior Teacher and Scale 4 teachers. Even with these assumptions the calculations indicate

*Details of the calculations are available from the author on request.

with some confidence an order of magnitude for promotional opportunity, and illustrate the gravity of the reality of the generally feared 'sharp decline in promotion prospects'.

They also indicate the growing inappropriateness of existing Burnham regulations, admittedly developed for an expanding service, and reveal a need for their speedy and radical reform to meet the long period of contraction ahead.

In support of this conclusion one LEA employing over 1,500 secondary teachers records 33% of teachers on Scale 1, and has calculated that on current trends the average time for their promotion to Scale 2 is ten years.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that, unless the present structure of salaries and scale posts is modified radically - and it must be remembered that such restructuring invariably seems to increase total expenditure - the secondary sector will be operating during the next decade with a careers structure and promotion prospects having many of the characteristics of a mediaeval society. Every person will know his place in the service of the 1980s, and there will seem very little prospect of its changing for many years. There will be the 'rich man in his castle' (Scale 4) and the 'poor man at his gate' (Scale 1), each in his place as ordained by the historical accidents of the expansion of the 1960s and 1970s. But each will be expected to continue to work to the glory of the education service, and make whatever contributions his talents, and his Head, may bring forth.

The management tasks and problems of the Head during this time would seem largely to depend upon the reactions of the teachers. At one extreme they may resist and direct their affiliations and energies to Union militancy in long-running battles with impotently intransigent LEAs and the DES, leaving the Head with little to do but keep his school operational somehow and cope with emergencies as they arise. At the other extreme they may accept the inevitable inequities of the status quo, realise the impracticability of diverting more

public expenditure into a contracting secondary education service, and settle for the satisfactions of a reasonably secure and full professional development dedicated to the improved education of the pupils in their charge.

The Motivation of Teachers in a Contracting System

Secondary teachers have long been accustomed to regular and relatively rapid promotions for a high proportion of their members. Less than 14% of all secondary teachers over 29 years of age were on Scale 1 in 1977. The higher scale posts are distributed with remarkable uniformity across the age ranges above 25, with clear peaks around particular age groups that increase in age with the level of promotion (DES, 1977, vol.4, table 21). Thus, 45% of 25-29s are Scale 2, over 30% of 30-39s are Scale 3, and almost 20% of 35-39s are Scale 4. Whatever the intrinsic satisfactions to be derived from the work of being a teacher and a member of the school's staff, they are almost invariably reinforced by extrinsic rewards expressed in terms of increased salary and status. And for the willingly mobile, ambitious and able, there was a relatively high probability of achieving a headship.

Influencing the behaviour of 'subordinates' was facilitated by headteachers, and even more for heads of department, by their ability to offer promotional rewards in return for, or in anticipation of, successful performance of new or additional work, or the acceptance of increased responsibilities.

This situation is now changing rapidly to one in which the opportunities for promotion have become rare, and may shortly almost disappear. It is clearly appropriate to consider by what means stagnation and apathy are to be avaoided, and the changes in attitudes, practices and structure are to be achieved if comprehensive education is to survive as we know it, and to improve.

Satisfaction at Work 'Causes' Performance

The view has long been held, almost as a precept from common-

sense, that a happy worker is a high performing worker, and that it is the degree of satisfaction felt in the level of work that determines, or at least influences significantly, the level of his performance. This view was given some degree of academic support, for a time at least, by the 'Human Relations' movement. It has also been readily accepted and adapted by many managers because it represents a line of least resistance, and because it is far more pleasant to try and increase a worker's happiness than to deal directly with his performance (Freene, 1977).

More recent theoretical work (e.g. Vroom and Deci, 1970) suggests that satisfaction with work is a force acting on the worker to continue his job. Whether or not this simple attractiveness of the job does lead to higher performance is now open to considerable doubt, at least among academics. Herzberg (1966) in his controversial studies deriving from the 'hierarchy of needs' model of Maslow (1943), attempted to meet these doubts by developing a theory in which two distinct sets of factors contribute to two distinct types of feeling or satisfaction: the 'hygiene' factors concerned with all the circumstances of the performance of work (including salary, supervision and working conditions), which serve to retain the organisation's members; and 'motivators' which are concerned with the worker's feelings and satisfactions in performing the work itself and the outcomes of this performance - needed to stimulate the worker to more than minimal levels of performance. Herzberg's work has been widely accepted by practising managers - cynics suggest because he proposes ways of increasing worker satisfaction and performance without paying them higher salaries - but is also heavily criticised for being bound by its methodology which is based on the individual's personal reaction to self-identified critical incidents. Thus, it is suggested, an individual will always tend to attribute his dissatisfaction in his work to the actions and influence of others, while attributing to himself and his performance at work the sources of his happiness and satisfaction with his job.

Performance at Work 'Causes' Satisfaction with Work

More recently others, notably Lawler and Porter (1967) have advanced a proposition which reverses the direction of causality of the first model. According to this theory, satisfaction is not a cause but an effect of high performance. People are satisfied with their work because they perform it well, and their performance provides them with 'rewards' that they value. For this model to have operational value it is necessary to be much more explicit about the nature of rewards, worker's perceptions and valuations of them, and the factors which influence the relationship between his work effort and level of performance.

The Expectancy Theory of Motivation

This, from which the Porter-Lawler model is derived, is based on two primary concepts:

- the concept of effort-reward probability: the subjective probability held by an individual that a certain level of effort will lead to a certain level of performance, and the subjective probability that this performance will lead in turn to certain rewards;

- the concept of reward value: the individual's perception/valuation of the reward that may be expected to be obtained by performing effectively.

Thus, there are two variables affecting the effort an individual is prepared to put into a particular work activity:

- the probability he attaches to rewards depending upon effort;
- the value he attaches to the rewards resulting from his effort, with 'performance' mediating between 'effort' and 'reward'.

There appear to be two other variables affecting performance and therefore affecting the relationship between effort and performance:

- ability, as the individual's current developed power to perform, involving such characteristics as knowledge, skills and personality traits all of which have the common feature of being relatively stable and comprising long-term characteristics of the individual. They can be modified, particularly knowledge and skills, but generally only in the relatively long-term.

- role perception, a more situationally dependent and modifiable variable: the kinds of activities an individual feels he should engage in to perform his job successfully. Thus role perceptions determine the direction in which an individual applies his effort. An individual's role perceptions can be termed 'accurate' or 'appropriate' if his views about the direction of his effort corresponds closely with the view of others in the organisation. Thus an inaccurate role-perception may lead to a considerable individual expenditure of effort without a corresponding high level of performance.

In the next decade the Head's main tasks will be to preserve and increase, in a contracting system, the levels of effort and performance of staff and pupils; and, following Porter and Lawler, their satisfaction also. Whatever the 'intrinsic' rewards of teaching they have, in the past and for the most part, been reinforced by the 'extrinsic' rewards of regular and occasionally dramatic promotions. In the future the Head's patronage through promotions will almost disappear, and his influence upon 'the behaviour of his subordinates' will rest upon their perceived value of such intrinsic rewards he may be able to create through his leadership and management of his school.

References

DES (1977), Statistics of Education. HMSO.

Fiske, Dudley (1979), Falling Numbers in Secondary Schools:

Problems and Possibilities. Paper presented to the North of England Education Conference, 1979; published by Sheffield City Polytechnic, Department of Education Management, 1979 (Sheffield Papers in Education Management, No.4).

Greene, C.N. (1977), "The satisfaction performance controversy," in K.O. Magnusen (ed), Organisational Design, Development and Behaviour. Scott, Foresman.

Herzberg, F. (1966), "The motivation-hygiene theory", in V.H. Vroom and E.L. Deci (eds) (1970), Management and Motivation. Penguin.

Lawler, E.E. (1973), Motivation in Work Organisations. Burks Cole.

Lawler, E.E. and L. Porter (1967), "Antecedent attitudes of effective managerial performance", in Vroom and Deci (1970), op. cit.

Maslow, A.H. (1943), "A theory of motivation", in Vroom and Deci (eds), (1970), op. cit.

Spooner, R. (1979), "Falling rolls, 13", Education, 4 May 1979.

Vroom, V.H. and E.L. Deci (eds), (1970), Management and Motivation. Penguin.

THE PRIMARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM IN A CONTRACTING SITUATION

Mrs P.E. Young

Lecturer
Institute of Education
University of London

The outward manifestation of a shrinking school population can be observed and charted in the number of infant and junior school amalgamations which have taken place; in the reducing enrolments of many primary schools; in the figures relating to teacher redeployment; and the failure to replace teachers who have moved on or retired. The research of which this is a preliminary report addresses itself to a question related to these changes: What, if any, has been the significance of these and other connected changes for the primary school curriculum, its content, method and organisation?

The LEAs and their Primary Schools

Two local education authorities agreed to allow this study to take place. Authority 'A' had been experiencing the falling roll situation for three years. Authority 'B' was feeling the initial effects with the 1978 intake into the first year of the primary school. Both authorities (pre May 1979 elections) were committed to a policy of keeping schools open wherever educationally feasible. They were both also asking a similar question: Is the existing pupil/teacher ratio to be adhered to in a period of contraction or are the schools to be allowed to benefit from the retention of existing staff and to have a gradually improving pupil/teacher ratio? This is a question which many authorities have asked themselves. It is a product of the fixed ratio formula adopted by many LEAs, resulting in a linear scale. One of the

problems of using a fixed ratio is that it does not always reflect the way in which many of our primary schools are organised and change. A second problem is that we cannot assume, as in secondary schools, that this fixed staffing ratio is considerably lower than the accepted teaching group. Commonly, the ratio in the primary sector is all too near the actual teaching group with seldom any question of teachers over. This leaves very little, if any margin for flexibility in organisation. A decision to have the withdrawal groups for the gifted child and the child requiring remedial work becomes a professional dilemma: do we increase class size in order to continue with groups? If class size is increased, what is the likely impact upon our commitment to individual learning programmes, and so on?

The question set out in the above paragraph is part of a much larger question which concerns LEAs and schools: How do we make provision for a 'satisfactory' curricular programme for primary pupils in a declining roll situation? Five primary schools in both authorities were prepared to permit observation and interviews in their institutions. They were selected by the advisory team to represent the different school forms which occur in the five to eleven age range, and for the reason that they were experiencing a fall (to a greater or lesser extent) in pupil numbers. These two factors were sufficient to uncover a range of problems related to the primary curriculum: the amalgamation of an infant and junior school to form a 'new' primary school; the redeployment of 1.5 teachers from a staff of seven teachers; the proposed reduction in capitation to adjust to the declining roll; a reduction in the number of scale points a school can offer. These are but four examples.

The Primary School Curriculum

Individual school staffs were asked to indicate what they thought were the important elements of the primary curriculum for their school. There was a broad measure of agreement that isbest summed up by reference to Chapter 5 in DES (1978), where is listed skills and attitudes; language and literacy; mathematics; science; aesthetic and physical education and social studies. The teachers were then asked as a staff group how, in their opinion, these parts of the curriculum had been influenced by the falling pupil roll. Teacher opinion was thought to be of considerable importance in determining a frame of reference with which to examine the curriculum. This work is yet to be collated and analysed. Some general remarks drawn from these discussions were:

> "When a musician, Mrs G. left, she was not replaced because of the drop in numbers; we felt her loss.
>
> "We had to rethink our team teaching for the top infants when Miss A went elsewhere. Was it still viable as a teaching method?
>
> "We (a junior school) have now to consider our groupings. Family or vertical grouping is not really what we want for top juniors, but it will have to be discussed."

These experiences are consistent with points made for example by Hardcastle (1978) and Briault (1979). The teachers in theschools were having to engage in a form of 'cost-benefit' analysis that was new to them.

Provisional Findings

Examples of preliminary findings of this piece of research are:

Values.

The most noticable impact on the primary curriculum was to be observed in the schools where an amalgamation had taken place between an infant and a junior school on the same site. Apart from casual contact, little previous interchange of educational ideas had taken place and considerable difficulties

were being experienced in developing shared values about the 'new' school. There was a reluctance to replace the distinctive junior and infant atmospheres with a 5-11 notion of continuous development. A similar kind of problem was recorded during the period of secondary reorganisation where staffs of grammar schools and secondary modern schools were amalgamated and much may be learnt from these examples. The choice of head teacher is probably crucial in developing these shared values, and current primary school management programmes may well need to include an examination of the attendant problems of an amalgamation in their courses.

This question of shared values showed itself in a number of ways. One head teacher was experiencing difficulty in getting both staffs to use a single staff room. In another, comments relating to the way in which the capitation was allocated, indicated that the infant staff felt that their aims and objectives were not fully understood. The problem of 'shared values' was not confined to amalgamations. Where a school had declined in numbers, teachers were assessing the values they held and were speculating about their reappraisal.

Buildings

With the fall in pupil roll, space in schools has been released, often for the first time in living memory. This was seen as a positive gain by the schools. Where previously the head teacher had had to give up his own room as a teaching space, classrooms and other accommodation became available and alternative groupings were possible. One school was able to establish a school library and a resource centre where previously corridor and cupboards had been the only alternative. Thought has also been given to other usage for the freed space. 'Outside' groups have expressed interest in day-time school locations.

Teachers

The transfer or move by the teacher who was a

'generalist' rather than a 'specialist' would not superficially appear to have much impact. Closer examination of individual strengths of a team member would indicate a change, e.g. the teacher who had successfully taught a particular age range for some years was now being required to teach a vertical group or a different age group, without prior re-training. Many of the tasks and skills are the same but curriculum content and pedagogy are likely to be different. Thus, there is a transitional period before the teacher adjusts to the new situation. Without doubt, there are a number of 'specialists' in the primary schools; teachers who have developed particular skills in reading, teaching the gifted child, and so on. When such 'specialists' are transferred or move on voluntarily, a replacement is often difficult to find. The head is no longer in a position to offer a scale post to attract the experienced teacher and a Scale 1 teacher is assigned in place of the 'specialist'. Often the new teacher is very competent in the classroom but cannot replace the 'inspirational' or 'enabler' specialist teacher who had assisted other teachers in curriculum development. A close scrutiny of this problem is intended as part of the study.

Observations

The following are offered as questions and comments for further discussion:

1. Primary teachers may well remain in a school for some time. What of job satisfaction?
2. Will the number of 'specialists' increase and work perhaps on a peripatetic basis?
3. The 'extended professional' rather than the 'restricted professional' model may come to the fore.
4. Capitation levels. Many of the needs of the school are not related to size.

5. Greater emphasis may be placed on the head teacher's ability to lead a team where strengths are capitalized on to promote 'the essential primary curriculum'.

Conclusions

To examine the primary curriculum and now it has been affected by falling rolls, is to look at a problem with many dimensions. It is intended to report on this work in ten primary schools more fully elsewhere. At this stage, it has been possible only to indicate in broad terms that the primary school curriculum is in some danger of being impaired as a consequence of falling pupil rolls.

References

Briault, E. (1979), "The politics of primary contraction", Education 3-13, vol.7, no.1, pp.8-13.

Department of Education and Science (1978), Primary Education in England: a Survey by H.M. Inspectors of Schools. HMSO.

Hardcastle, K.W. (1978), "A reducing diet for primary schools," Education, 15 September 1978, p.229.

THE EVALUATION OF
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Eric Hoyle

Professor of Education
University of Bristol

The topic of this paper covers a very large area of theory, research and practice. Inevitably some selection has had to be made in terms of content and approach. Hence the purpose of the paper is to consider some of the issues involved in evaluating educational institutions - or, rather, one kind of educational institution, as discussion will be confined to the school. What is not being offered is a review of the literature, and, in fact, references will be kept to a minimum. However, one important reference must be noted at the outset. In preparing this paper I found myself caught up at many points with the same issues which have been discussed in the recent accountability debate. The most valuable writing in this area is contained in in a series of papers prepared for an SSRC seminar on accountability and subsequently edited by Tony Becher and Stuart Maclure (1978). I shall have occasion to refer to a number of these papers but those which I do not happen to cite are relevant to many of the points under discussion in this paper.

The paper will fall into four main sections, viz.:

1. Problems involved in the evaluation of schools;
2. Some suggestions for the evaluation of schools;
3. Needed developments in theory and research which might contribute to better evaluation;
4. Continuing problems: professional autonomy, the validity of knowledge gained by evaluation, and the micropolitics of organisations.

1. Problems involved in the evaluation of the Effectiveness of Schools

Many of these problems have been widely discussed in recent years, mainly in the context of curriculum evaluation and accountability. Hence the summary offered here will be skeletal.

What is meant by effectiveness?

Such a question is calculated to frighten the life out of any student of the management of organisations. There is a substantial literature dealing with this issue (e.g. Price, 1968; Steers, 1975) but this mainly focusses on industrial organisations in which objectives such as production and profit are relatively clear, though nevertheless still difficult to assess. The concept of the effectiveness of an educational organisation is much more complex.

Broadly speaking effectiveness is the degree to which an organisation approximates to achieving its goals. (It is still probably worthwhile maintaining the old distinction between effectiveness and efficiency - the latter being the amount of resources utilised in producing a unit of output. Needless to say the debate about efficiency - can schools achieve the same effectiveness with fewer resources - is going to loom large in the coming months).

Effectiveness then, would be a reasonably straightforward concept if the concept of organisational goal were equally clear. Needless to say, it isn't. All manner of difficulties are raised by the concept of school goals. An argument mounted particularly by phenomenologically-inclined sociologists holds that organisations as such cannot have goals. What may appear to be organisational goals are the purposes of the winners between competing interest groups. Others argue that the activities of all organisations, and perhaps particularly of schools, are perhaps only minimally concerned with the pursuit of clearly identified goals. And other writers, as we shall see below, point out that schools can have a variety of 'goals' not all of which could be

conceived as 'output' goals.

Sociological colleagues must forgive me if I do not rehearse these old arguments yet again and use them to discredit the possibility of ever having any knowledge of a school's effectiveness. The assessment of effectiveness is a legitimate demand and however intractable the problem we should continue to explore the possibilities whilst recognizing, and pointing out to others who may have simplistic notions of evaluating schools, what the difficulties are.

What is the purpose of evaluation?

When exploring the possibilities of evaluating the effectiveness of schools one must ask this preliminary question. Two basic answers are possible: evaluation can be part of the process of the accountability of the school to its stakeholders, or it can be part of the management process of the school whereby it acquires feedback on its performance in order to improve it. Of course, one can answer that evaluation should serve the purposes of both accountability and feedback but if the balance is on one side or the other, different modes of evaluation may be necessary, and if it is to serve both purposes, the strategies of evaluation will have to be thought out very carefully in order to avoid distortion.

Who should be the evaluators?

The answer to this question is contingent upon the answer to the previous question. The groups who currently evaluate schools do so with relative degrees of formality, authority, expertise and do so for different purposes.

HMI have formal authority, expertise largely in the curriculum area with perhaps some management knowledge, evaluate mainly informally but sometimes formally and for the dual purpose of assisting the school to improve its effectiveness and monitoring that effectiveness on behalf of government.

Advisers approximate to HMI, but perhaps have less formal authority, and emphasise feedback rather than accountability.

Governors and managers have representative authority and combine a support and evaluation role, but have limited expertise, though they have access to some expertise via LEA staff.

School staff are in an advantageous position to undertake internal evaluation particularly for the purpose of providing feedback for improving organisational effectiveness, but the authority which any such evaluation would have in the eyes of other professionals and of stakeholders is dubious. The expertise of members of the school staff to undertake evaluation will be variable, it will be strongest in the curriculum area and perhaps weakest in the areas which require, for example, the use of psychometric techniques in evaluation.

Researchers located in universities, polytechnics, colleges, foundations and so forth will be particularly strong on evaluation expertise but, of course, weak in authority (i.e. legal authority rather than authority derived from expertise). The involvement of researchers in evaluation will often be linked to particular projects and will thus not be school-focussed evaluation as such. Their involvement in school-focussed evaluation will be necessarily limited because of the small number of researchers and the limitations of their time. Nevertheless the use of researchers has considerable potential but the accountability/feedback dilemma will be particularly acute. The relationship of the researcher or researcher/consultant with the school can take many forms which cannot be listed here. For a discussion of action and applied research largely within industrial contexts, see Clark,(1972).

At the present time evaluation is a somewhat ad hoc activity

with authority being diffuse and distributed between different groups and expertise somewhat likewise. A strategy of institutional evaluation would involve a careful delineation of both of these variables and consideration of existing, or possibly new, roles.

What criteria of effectiveness are to be adopted?

This fundamental problem has been widely and inconclusively debated in recent years. The problem is particularly acute because the goals of schools are diverse, diffuse, long term and - though stress may be placed on one or the other - meet both individual and social needs. The lack of consensus about educational goals means that a whole range of criteria may be considered appropriate by different groups. A broad distinction can be made between product criteria and process criteria.

Product. Product criteria include the cognitive outcomes of schooling as assessed directly by tests and public examinations, or indirectly through such indices as entry to higher and further education and entry to occupation. They also include the non-cognitive outcomes of schooling in the moral and social domain as assessed directly by tests, less directly by various rating scales and indirectly by such indices as delinquency.

Process. Process criteria embrace nothing less than the quality of schooling, the experience to which pupils are exposed via curriculum, teaching, grouping for instruction, informal group membership, pastoral care and so on. Process-product evaluation attempts to account for the outcomes of schooling in terms of the experiences which pupils have had. Process evaluation is concerned with making an assessment of provision which schools make for their pupils. In one sense process evaluation is 'unsatisfactory' insofar as it does not provide information about output. But there is nevertheless value in attempting evaluation of, say, the balance of the curriculum, the quality of careers advice, the quality of staff-pupil relationships and so forth.

David Hargreaves (1967) tells us little about the 'product' of Lumley School, but he tells us a good deal about some aspects of process.

Management. Management evaluation is perhaps one aspect of process evaluation in that the effectiveness of management is an important determinant of the quality of the school as an environment for teaching and learning, and, one may assume although the technical problems of verifying the assertion are formidable, of the cognitive and non-cognitive outcomes of schooling. The evaluation of the management process can focus on the 'task' dimensions of management (planning, budgeting, etc.) but in a professionally-staffed institution which is concerned with bringing about changes in people and which is relations-intensive, as is the case with schools, the evaluation of the management process tends to focus mainly on professional and interpersonal climate.

What modes of evaluation are available?

A forbiddingly wide range of procedures is available for the evaluation of various criteria of effectiveness. These have been widely discussed in the literature on evaluation and can only be briefly touched upon here. In an excellent wide-ranging but concise paper on which this section draws heavily Nisbet (1979) identified five different styles of assessment for accountability:

> Five different styles of assessment for accountability are considered here: standardised tests, conventional examinations, inspection, pupil record cards and self-assessment by schools. This order of arrangement moves from one extreme of external, formal, judgmental, product-oriented, analytic assessment, to the other extreme of internal, informal, descriptive, process-oriented, holistic assessment. Inspection is in the middle position because, though external, it can be either judgmental or descriptive, formal or informal.
>
> There is a sixth procedures which is not considered here, the voucher system. This is a method of

creating accountability, using customer reaction in an open market as a crude single measure of a school's acceptability.

Stake (1976) distinguishes eight dimensions on which evaluation procedures may vary:

formative	summative
formal	informal
case-particular	generalisation
product	process
descriptive	judgmental
pre-ordinate	responsive
holistic	analytic
internal	external

and nine different styles of procedure:

student gain by testing
institutional self-study by staff
blue-ribbon panel
transaction-observation
management analysis
instructional research (a statistical model)
social policy analysis
goal-free evaluation
adversary evaluation

John Nisbet also includes House's taxonomy of evaluatio models, mainly to show the frighteningly wide range of techniques available. And to add to the complexity of the issue I give here the stringest criteria which Nisbet lists for the selection of methods of evaluation. He argues that they should be fair, be valid, provide feedback, either be objective or make their subjectivity explicit, be verifiable, should not damage nor distort the processes of learning and teaching, be understandable and communicable, and be comprehensive.

Those who hold that school effectiveness is to be assessed by an evaluation of its 'product' often assumed that this is easily achieved, via examinations and test results. In practice, there are considerable problems. In a recent valuable article, Gray (1979) lists the following difficulties:

1. how well a school performs in public examinations is heavily dependent on how well the pupils performed when they entered school;

2. The procedures which schools and LEAs currently use are inadequate;
3. Schools fluctuate in their effectiveness from year to year;
4. Efforts to assess effectiveness have been largely confined to measures of attainment rather than outcomes such as personal development;
5. The criteria which researchers have developed to assess school's effectiveness do not correlate with the judgements of experienced practitioners.

It follows from these difficulties that further developments are needed in the attempt to assess the effectiveness of products. For example:

1. There needs to be control for the contextual factors affecting the quality of the schools' intake;
2. Outputs need to be monitored over a number of years;
3. Factors internal to the school need to be taken into account, e.g. curricula followed, presentation policies, and adventitious factors such as staff departures;
4. Although achievement data would be part of the school's account they would need to be considered in a comparative context;
5. Public examination results are relevant only to a proportion of the school population and thus the issue is raised of comparative testing of the remainder;
6. Non-cognitive outcomes are notoriously difficult to measure by direct testing. Indirect assessment, e.g. via the incidence of delinquency raises a number of technical questions of control.

These are rather forbidding difficulties but as it is not likely that public interest in such outcmes will abate there is probably a need to continue to improve methodologies of evaluation but it is equally important that assessments should report the data in the context of all the qualifying

factors which need to be taken into account. This raises the question of the availability of expertise to undertake this form of evaluation - a point considered below.

2. Some suggestions for the evaluation of schools

This section has two purposes. The main one is to illustrate the sort of choices which it would be necessary to make when devising an evaluation strategy. The second purpose is to offer a proposal, in rather general terms, for how one might set about evaluating the effectiveness of schools. This will be set out as a number of propositions followed by a brief account of a possible procedure.

(a) The unit of evaluation should be the school with the internal evaluation of individuals undertaken as part of this process - except for the occasional need for crisis evaluation;

(b) The major purposes of evaluation is feedback to school staff as part of the normal process of management. A secondary purpose contributes to the external accountability of the school;

(c) Evaluation should be mainly internal and carried out by the staff of the school as part of the normal management process assisted where necessary and where possible by people with specialist skills (advisers, researchers). External evaluation would be by a group of professionals drawing largely on the evaluation reports provided by the school but arranging for other evaluation data to be collected where necessary.

(d) Evaluation would concentrate on process, but the evaluation of product would not be neglected;

(e) The techniques of evaluation cannot be specified for all schools. The choice would depend on what is being evaluated, what skills are available to the school or the professional group and on what basis an evaluation has been negotiated within the school and also between the school and the professional group.

(f) Interference in the normal work of the school should be kept to a minimum. It should not be excessively time consuming and thus detract from the prime task of the school.

A possible procedure might be the following:

1. Every five years the school would prepare a quinquennial plan covering such areas as curriculum (balance, choice), organisation (grouping, pastoral structure), resources (buildings, equipment, staff numbers and range of competence, ancilliary support), evaluation (proposed modes for internal evaluation), innovation (proposals, implementation and evaluation procedures, costs).

2. This plan would be presented to the professional group and to the governors for critical comment and negotiation.

3. Throughout the five year period internal school evaluation would proceed according to what had been agreed with the professional group. There would thus be no single approach, each school would vary in what it chose to evaluate and how. However, one would envisage that:

   (a) there would be an attempt to evaluate any major innovation;

   (b) there would be systematic monitoring of certain aspects of the school, e.g. an annual consideration of external examination results;

   (c) there would be less frequent evaluation of certain aspects of process, e.g. a particular curriculum area, the management structure, careers advice;

   (d) there would be crisis evaluation when fundamental problems were encountered;

   (e) schools would call on such expertize as could be made available from research workers, on an ad hoc basis.

4. The professional group and the governors would receive annual reports from the school which would refer to such evaluation carried out. Either group could ask for a more detailed evaluation report of any area of particular interest (e.g. an innovation) or of concern. A longer quinquennial report would be presented at the end of the period.

5. The professional group, and perhaps the governors, would be empowered to initiate external evaluations where this was thought to be helpful to the school - because the group could mobilise greater resources than the school itself, or where there was cause for concern.

I am aware, of course, that the above is extremely sketchy and that there are inherent problems of some magnitude concerned with questions of authority, expertise, professional integrity, time, the nature of accounts and so forth. I will not spell out these but leave others to do so in the context of the conference. One hopes to hear the views of people who are particularly interested in questions of authority or techniques of evaluation.

In the approach outlined above, evaluation is seen as an integral part of the process of problem-solving within the school. It is informed by recent approaches to the problem of how schools cope with innovation. Briefly the approach favoured by the present writer is that the most appropriate pattern of innovation is via the problem-solving school supported by appropriate outside agencies (inspectors, advisers, researchers etc.) part of whose task would be to contribute to the professional development of teachers via programmes of school-focussed in-service training designed in part to improve the curricular, managerial and interpersonal skills required by teachers if they are to implement and evaluate innovations in an effective manner.

Another influence on the above brief proposal for an evaluative strategy is the approach in higher education to evaluation by professional peers. There are obviously

some affinities with the CNAA approach to the courses which it validates (see Becher, 1978, for discussion of potentialities of this approach in schools) and the pattern of subject committees and main committee visitations by the UGC. This is not to suggest that institutions of higher education are particularly progressive in the internal evaluations but, the visitations referred to do lead to an institutional stock-taking and collection of data at least every few years.

3. Some necessary developments

This will be a somewhat unsystematic section, in fact little more than a list of some of the developments which are needed in order to improve the capacity of schools to evaluate their own effectiveness.

(a) Instrumentation. If schools are to evaluate their own products and processes, staff need to have access to, and training in, the use of various tests, questionnaires, interview schedules etc. The area of testing pupil progress by means of standardized instruments is, of course, by far the most advanced and many such tests are available and more continue to be developed by, for example, the NFER. The Assessment of Performance Unit too, of course, commissioned the preparation of tests in a number of subject areas but at the moment the intention is that these will be used for national monitoring and not for self-evaluation of schools. A number of agencies, particularly local authorities, are developing schedules which schools can complete in order to provide an inventory of internal activities. A number of university departments, and particularly at Sussex University, are developing schedules for the analysis and evaluation of curricula (Eraut, 1978). There is also the possibility of evaluation measures used in research projects being adopted, with due clearance from the research workers concerned, for internal evaluation purposes. For example, Rutter et al (1979) developed instruments concerned with pupil behaviour, school goals, school processes and so forth which might be adapted for internal evaluation. Although there are many instruments dealing with aspects of management, relatively few (of which OCDQ is

perhaps the best known) have been developed specifically for use in schools. However, work is proceeding in some aspects of management, particularly in the area of the adoption and implementation of innovation (McGeown, 1979). Perhaps as important as the development of instruments is to have what is available catalogued for consultation by teachers. An excellent compendium of tests-questionnaires etc. has been produced by Cohen (1976).

(b) Staff training. Evaluation requires research-type skills which many heads and teachers do not have. There are, of course, many university, polytechnic and college courses in research methods but training is likely to be more effective if it is specific to a particular task. There is here the case for more school-focussed in-service training concerned with helping school staff to devise or select appropriate instruments, administer them and interpret the results. Obviously the approach most likely to be successful is for a skilled researcher to act as a consultant/trainer for one school or a group of schools. An alternative approach is for a university or polytechnic department to run teacher research groups (as at Bristol, Lancaster, Birmingham and elsewhere) where teachers are helped and advised by specialist staff on their own school-related research problems. The trainer-role is particularly important where interpretative techniques are to be used to evaluate aspects of school process. CARE at the University of East Anglia is the institution which perhaps more than any other is building up experience in this area.

(c) Consultancy. There are many ways in which a consultant can relate to a school which is undertaking internal evaluation ranging broadly from a somewhat detatched role in which the consultant gathers data for interpretation and use by the school staff through to a form of action research in which the consultant is involved in the change process itself. A number of experiments in research consultancy have been undertaken in recent years but perhaps still the most fully documented is Elizabeth Richardson's work at Nailsea School (Richardson, 1973).

(d) Data archives. Schools will inevitably wish to compare their own effectiveness with that of other schools. In order to do so in any systematic way an archive of comparative data would be a helpful facility. Perhaps one of the most interesting recent developments in the utilisation of knowledge is the Collaborative Research Programme based at the Centre for Educational Sociology, Edinburgh University, directed by Andrew MacPherson and funded by the SSRC. The Centre has accumulated a considerable amount of data on Scottish school leavers by means of surveys and it is the purpose of the programme to train administrators, inspectors, heads and teachers - through attendance at a two-day course - how to extract from the archive data relevant to the particular problems which they are confronting. Gray (1979) has identified three areas in which there has been a demand for information: "(i) to monitor established policies; (ii) to contribute to the evaluation of innovations; and (iii) to go beyond the public examination record to consider other dimensions of pupils' educational experiences". An account of the use made by schools and teachers of these data is given in Cope and Gray (1978).

(e) Organisational research. In order to improve the evaluation of organisations we need to know more about how they function. Although there has been a good deal of theorising about schools as organisations over the past fifteen years, good empirical studies are few and far between. Sociologists have become so hung up on theoretical and epistemological issues that empirical work has remained underdeveloped. The concept of effectiveness generates so many conceptual and empirical problems that most sociologists of organisations would fight shy of undertaking research in this area. It has been left to Michael Rutter, a child psychiatrist, to get to grips with this problem in a manner which, though it might strike the sociologist as simplistic, at least grasps the nettle of measuring effectiveness. Basic research on organisational processes is certainly needed, but there is also a strong case for studies which focus on the genuine organisational problems which schools face in such areas as innovation, decision-making, community links and so forth.

4. Continuing Problems

The three issues briefly discussed here constitute a personal selection from what would be a very lengthy list.

(a) Control versus autonomy in the teaching profession

This perennial problem is generated yet again by the question of evaluation. Recent concerns over accountability and evaluation have had their roots in the fear that the relative autonomy of schools and teachers, combined with an assumed low level of professionality amongst teachers, was having a deleterious effect on standards. The balance between autonomy and control is a difficult one to get right. Both are needed: schools and teachers, like other professionals, need a degree of autonomy if they are to be effective, stakeholders need the reassurance which some degree of external control can bring. At the present time there is an aspiration towards greater control. The bias in this paper has been toward a preference for schools being largely responsible for their own evaluation, and this may seem to be contrary to what appears to be a widespread desire for greater control over schools. The difficulty is that external evaluation is far from being as simple as many people believe. Even if it were to concentrate on products as conventionally assessed, technical difficulties abound. An overemphasis on tight control and narrow product evaluation would lead eventually to the de-professionalisation of teachers. Paradoxically, the approach which is dominant in this paper is predicated on increased professionalization - the extension of the teacher's professional skills to enable her to contribute to the process of internal evaluation. It may well appear to those who are concerned about what is happening in schools that self-evaluation of school programmes is dodging the problem in giving teachers themselves a large measure of the responsibility for this process. There are, to be sure, problems in this approach, but with the safeguard of external oversight of internal evaluation and the possibility of crisis evaluation, this does appear to be the most sensible way forward.

(b) The validity of knowledge

There has been running through this paper thus far the assumption that evaluation eventuates in objectively valid knowledge. However, one does not have to accept completely the relativistic stance of the newer developments in the social sciences to have some reservation about this assumption. This is not the context into which to enter into epistemological issues but one should perhaps recognise the strengths and limitations of the empirical-objective and the interpretative-subject approaches to evaluation and particularly recognize that objectively valid data - particularly about process rather than product - are difficult to acquire. When data are acquired through asking questions of individuals there is a major problem in determining what is objective since different roles, different interests - personal and sectional - and different pressures yield different interpretations. This is not to take a wholly relativistic standpoint and deny the existence of objective knowledge independent of men's minds, but it is to say that it is difficult to get at it through the different interpretations made by people holding different positions in the social system. Teachers, administrators and researchers may have different ways of knowing and perhaps one ought not to make assumptions that one way of knowing is more valid, or more objective, than another. Of course, the traditional task of the researcher is to transcend partial perspectives in his quest for valid knowledge, but we must appreciate that the researcher has his own interests which may partly shape what he looks for and what he finds. For example, the researcher 'knows' that effectiveness is not increased with a reduction in class size. This is an extremely common finding even when the obvious variables have been controlled. Yet teachers 'know' that they are more effective with smaller classes. Whose knowledge is then the more valid?

Interpretations are an important component of the set of variables which researchers must examine. Mixed ability

grouping may or may not be 'objectively' more effective than grouping by ability, but it is extremely difficult to reach objective knowledge because teachers' interpretations of the effectiveness of one form of grouping or the other will be a determinant of that effectiveness. It is thus difficult to get beyond these interpretations and the more subjective approaches to evaluation take these interpretations as data, and the task of the researcher is to identify them and to explore their origins and consequences.

This view of knowledge is not seen as particularly helpful by the administrator who would prefer unequivocal, objective valid knowledge on which to base decisions. Thus the relationship between research and policy is an uncertain one. It is also relatively uncharted although the Social Science Research Council is beginning to explore this territory beginning with an initial review of the state of the art directed by John Nisbet and conducted by Tricia Broadfoot.

(c) The micropolitics of organizations

This problem, like the problem of valid knowledge, is raised in order to offset any unduly rationalistic bias in the previous sections of the paper. The picture presented is of teachers-as-professionals acquiring and exercising the skills which would enable them to evaluate their work and to take the necessary measures to improve any malfunctioning. There is a temptation amongst management and organizational theorists to impose a rational pattern on situations which are not particularly characterised by rational behaviour. On the argument of the preceding section on knowledge, organizations are not characterised so much by irrationality as by the competing rationalities of different interest groups. The contemporary student of organizations perceives these competing rationalities as data, the student of management has hitherto tended to impose a degree of rationality on organizations. However, theorists of administration and management have recently begun to explore the micropolitics of organizations to a greater degree: the negotiating, bargaining and subverting behaviour through which participants seek to sustain

their own interests. March's "garbage can" theory of decision-making is a piece of work in this area which avoids imputing a high degree of rationality to decision-making and explores instead the far from 'rational' ways in which decisions do or do not get taken (March and Olsen, 1976). It is salutary, therefore, at the end of this paper to remind oneself that the aspiration towards a rational approach to evaluation must always be weighed against the deep-seated interests which will function to limit this expression.

Conclusion

This has been a somewhat rambling paper, but basically the argument has been as follows:

- Institutional evaluation has two functions: accountability and feedback;
- The aspiration towards hard-nosed product evaluation for the purpose of accountability is quite legitimate;
- However, there are considerable technical and other problems involved in this approach to evaluation, which are frequently underestimated;
- A preferred approach is for the school to be largely responsible for its own evaluation but with external control by fellow professionals and by 'stakeholders';
- Internal evaluation is predicated upon an extended professionality amongst teachers which embraces skills relevant to evaluation;
- At the present time these skills are to be found amongst teachers only to a limited degree and therefore programs of in-service training (especially school-focussed) are necessary;
- But even if progress were to be made in this direction the problems of the conflict between control and autonomy, between objective and subjective knowledge,

and between competing rationalities, will persist.

References

Becher, T. and S. Maclure (1978), Accountability in Education. National Foundation for Educational Research.

Clark, P.A. (1972), Action Research and Organizational Change. London: Harper and Row.

Cope, E. and J. Gray (1978), Teachers as Researchers: Some Experience of an Alternative Paradigm. Edinburgh: Centre for Educational Sociology, University of Edinburgh.

Cohen, L. (1976), Educational Research in Classrooms and Schools: a Manual of Materials and Methods. London: Harper and Row.

Eraut, M. (1978), "Accountability at the school level," in Becher and Maclure, op.cit.

Gray, T. (1979), "The statistics of accountability," Education Policy Bulletin, 7(1), Spring.

Hargreaves, D. (1967), Social Relations in a Secondary School. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

House, E.G. (1977), "Assumptions underlying evaluation models," cited by Nisbet, op.cit.

Kogan, M. (1978), "The impact policy implications of monitoring procedures," in Becher and Maclure, op.cit.

MacDonald, B. (1978), "Accountability standards and the process of schooling," in Becher and Maclure, op.cit.

Maclure, S. and T. Becher (1978), "Accounting procedures and educational processes," in Becher and Maclure op.cit.

McGeown, V. (1979), "School innovativeness and process and product;" Organizational climate for change in schools: Towards definition and measurement"; "School principals' decision-making behaviour in the management if onnovation". Coleraine: New University of Ulster.

Nisbet, J. (1978), "Procedures for assessment," in Becher and Maclure, op.cit.

Price, J.L. (1968), Organisational Effectiveness: An Inventory of Propositions. Irwin.

Richardson, J.E. (1973), The School, the Teacher and the Task of Management. Heinemann.

Rutter, M. et al. (1979), Fifteen Thousand Hours. Open Books.

Stake, R.E. (1977), Evaluating Educational Programmes: the Need and the Response. Paris: OECD/CER.

Steers, Roy (1975), "Problems in the management or organizational effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly, vol.20, pp.526-538.

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

John Calvert

Loughborough University of Technology

Most educational systems have a number of objectives which not infrequently are inconsistent. Universal agreement among educators is confined to large generalisations which tend to establish the boundaries of social policy rather than give content to realisable goals - "to preserve and enhance the intellectual stock", "to facilitate equal opportunity", and so on. It is difficult to disagree with any common understanding of such bromides and equally difficult to deploy them usefully in a management context. The more detailed the list of goals the more likely it is to be disputed in terms of inclusions, omissions and interpretations. However, there seems to be broad agreement on the major output programmes for higher education - instruction (or the transmission of knowledge), and research (or the acquisition of knowledge).

Crude Measures of Input and Output

There are at least two schools of thought on how to conceptualize the outcomes of the teaching function: firstly, the changes in students' characteristics associated with various institutional input and process variables; amd secondly, the characteristics of the learning opportunities made available. The changes wrought in students' skills, knowledge, attitudes and values between entry to, and exit from, university reflect <u>their</u> learning functions and are only indirectly related to the institution's production function. The outcomes attributable to the institution (and to the

institution alone) are the magnitude and quality of the services made available. Therefore, the student enrolment on undergraduate and postgraduate programmes is a crude proxy for the magnitude of teaching services made available. This assumes that the quality of the places provided on an organised curriculum is comparable both within and across institutions.

The measurement of research output is immensely difficult. Various processes have been suggested - a weighted sum of the publications produced, the level of research funds attracted, or the quality-weighted hours spent on personal research (Layard and Verry, 1973). A crude measure of research output is the expenditure from research grants in a given period. Of course, this is essentially an input measure and its use can only be justified as an attempt to obtain a more realistic mapping of the teaching outcomes.

The measures of inputs is not quite so difficult but still causes problems. One can count academic staff or total their salaries, but it is infinitely more difficult to bring in a quality measure. Similarly, one can count money spent on equipment etc., but not easily establish the input that equipment has into the teaching or research activity. Initially it is useful to use money values for inputs but also it is useful to incorporate the number of academic staff in case some institutions have the 'right' number of staff but at the 'wrong' salary levels, or vice versa.

The Efficiency Frontier

Educational institutions, like other organisations, consume a range of inputs and produce a range of outputs. However, some will do this more efficiently than others. If their performance is to be examined it seems feasible first to identify the 'technically more efficient' institutions and then use those as benchmarks against which the rest can be compared. If all the inputs and outputs are considered then intuitively these technically more efficient institutions will be on the boundary of the set of institutions

considered. The term 'efficiency frontier' refers to the part of the boundary determined by these technically more efficient institutions.

In practice more than two inputs and one output are involved and so the efficient frontier has to be found mathematically using a technique such as Linear Programming (Calvert, 1978).

Non-Frontier Institutions

Once the frontier institutions have been identified and the efficient frontier specified it is possible to compare a non-frontier institution with one on the boundary. The ideal method is to compare two institutions with the same mix of inputs but different levels of outputs (Farrell, 1957). This delays the attachment of weights or subjective values to inputs or outputs until the actual comparison is made, and means that the analysis, for the most part, is not carried out in 'funny money' but in actual numbers of students or pounds sterling spent, and so on. This is particularly relevent in educational management where the price or value of many of the inputs and outputs is not readily available.

An Illustration

The approach outlined above has, for the purposes of illustration only, been applied to the U.K. universities in 1972-73 and 1973-74 (Calvert 1978). The DES published statistics allowed the following variables to be used:

Outputs:
- undergraduate enrolment - full-time or full-time equivalent;
- postgraduate enrolment - full-time or full-time equivalent;
- expenditure in the academic year from research grants (a proxy for research involvement).

Inputs:
- total full-time teaching and research staff paid directly from university funds;
- salaries of teaching and research staff;

- other departmental salaries and wages;
- departmental and laboratory expenditure;
- total expenditure.

Out of the total sample of 49 institutions, 24 are identified as 'more efficient' in one or the other, or both, of the academic years examined; of these 16 appear on the frontier in both years, and the other 8 have a high ranking on at least one of the five output programmes examined in the year in which they were not on the boundary. Hence the efficiency frontier appears to be reasonably stable over the two years. An examination of the non-frontier institutions revealed 'staff numbers' and 'recurrent departmental and laboratory expenditure' as the critical constraining variables. It is on these variables that the majority of non-boundary institutions would have to operate if they wished to move towards the frontier.

Once the approach has been thoroughly tested on the sample set of crude measures of input and output of institutions it is hoped to carry out the following activities:

(1) Partition of the sample into 'Oxbridge', 'Red-brick', 'Ex-CAT' and so on, so that like is being compared with like;

(2) Test the approach within the institution using the Loughborough-Lanchester data (Birch, Calvert and Sizer, 1977);

(3) Look for better measures of input and output across and within institutions in the light of the results of using the crude measures outlined above.

This research is supported by the Social Scienc Research Council under the heading, 'A Feasibility Study: Tracing the Efficient Frontier in Higher Education' (Grant No. HR5976).

References

Birch, D.W., J.R. Calvert and J. Sizer (1977), "A case study of some performance indices in higher education in the U.K.", International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education, Vol. 1, No.2, pp.133-142.

Calvert, J.R. (1978), "The measurement of performance in higher education," PhD thesis, Loughborough University of Technology.

Farrell, M.J. (1957), "The measurement of productive efficiency," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A, Vol.120, Part III, pp.253-290.

Layard, P.R.G. and D. Verry (1973), Cost Functions for Teaching and Research in U.K. Universities. London School of Economics and Political Science, Higher Education Research Unit.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUPIL-INVOLVED ASSESSMENT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF EDUCATION

Mrs Elsa Davies

Headteacher
St Anne's County First School
Surrey C.C.

At the Surrey first school where I work, our staff decision to purchase a few items of a new style language programme acted as a catalyst on several curricular and professional areas. One of the most notable results of our gradual adoption of this language scheme was the change which took place in our pupil assessment and profiling procedures. The school taks pupils only up to the age of eight, but the issues which the latter change raises have far-reaching implications for any institution involved with pupil or student assessment.

The First Change: Introduction of a new style language development programme.

After seeing the items of a reading scheme based upon a multi-method approach to language teaching* displayed at school a decision was made to try some of the pre-literacy material in the classroom. Before doing so we had considerable discussion on the implications of increasing our use of the scheme: the educational merit apparent in the programme, ways in which parents might perceive it, and the large financial commitment which would follow. At the time, we did not appreciate the full implications of the change for the way reading was taught within the school, or the effect it would have on the teacher. We thought

---

* Scott Foresman Reading Systems, Scott, Foresman, 1971.

we were opting for a change in the content of our language programme and that through the injection of extra materials, we would be adjusting our method of teaching reading. What happened was that our attitudes to the teaching of reading were changed.

Looking back to 1975, when we first sampled the programme, we have discovered that the changes in both content and to a lesser degree method, were far more easily achieved than was the attitudinal change required by each of us as individual teachers. Bearing in mind that the gradual internalisation of a new idea may not progress at the same rate for each individual teacher, it was interesting to observe how the path towards the organisation's acceptance of change followed the pattern experienced by individual teachers. We all experienced a tremendous increase in our work load: a difficulty which was easier to understand than was the loss of confidence and the anxiety which we all felt at one time or another. There were times when we looked for a way of restructuring the scheme to fit in with our 'old' skills and times when we thought about returning to a more traditional way of teaching reading. We experienced confusion when our well-laid plans failed or when new situations or issues presented themselves unexpectedly. Although we supported each other through periods of doubt and misgiving, that which held us fast to our decision more than anything was the success, enthusiasm and pleasure experienced by the children as they progressed through the scheme. The 'backlash' which Nisbet (1974) describes was felt in 1979 when we were visited by HMI. By this time the language programme was being used throughout the school. Our solidarity as a staff through this period, while firmly based upon appreciation of the worth of the programme for the pupils, was also a product of the commitment which had grown from the formal and informal meetings to discuss, plan and evaluate the new scheme.

Staff participation in decision-making on all areas of school life had grown steadily since 1974, increasing in depth and breadth of discussion. Such co-operation placed a value upon the contribution of teachers to the organisation of the school and resulted in the development of teachers able to consider the whole enterprise with open minds and to criticise it constructively. The increased confidence which followed from participation in decision-making enabled teachers to appreciate the collective responsibility we shared for the development of the school in its entirety. Their new expertise as decision participants was evident in particular when the problems of management and organisational adaptation of the new language programme were under discussion. It was present also during consideration of the school's internal assessment procedures when the relevance and validity of these measures in relation to the new language programme were questioned. As the first change became more secure within the school, it became increasingly clear that we would have to revise our school's evaluation and recording procedures.

The Second Change: Adaptation of pupil profiling to include pupil involvement in individual assessment and extension of access to individual school records.

In this school, as in most first schools, evaluation occurs in several ways and werves different purposes. In the past internal measures of assessment involved the day-to-day hearing of pupils read, giving some guide to pupil progress, although it was frequently a painful experience for many pupils. At the end of each reading book in the traditional scheme, children were assessed for fluency, and word recognition and analysis. The Schonell Graded Reading Vocabulary Test (Schonell, 1950) was used each year to assess a pupil's ability to read words out of context. As our new language programme was based on the use of contextual cues, we became aware of the deficiencies of our traditional methods of evaluation. Consequently, instead of just adapting the language monitoring procedures,

we decided to review the assessment and pupil profiling system as a whole.

As well as covering some of the more practical considerations of communication and information storage, we found our staff discussion increasingly focussing upon the usefulness of assessment to the teacher, the pupil and the parents. Our exploration of alternative evaluation procedures led to our discovery of the value of individual diagnostic mastery tests linked to our new language programme. We now administer these tests to pupils when they have completed each stage of the scheme and are beginning work on the next stage. Not only are these tests successful as a record of achievement for the pupil's school notes, but they provide the ideao opportunity for involving a pupil in his own assessment.

When completed, these tests are marked by the pupil and teacher together. As the marking proceeds, each can identify those skills in which additional practice is needed. As a consequence, a programme of action to remedy any weak areas can be devised between pupil and teacher, and if there is some doubt as to whether extra practice is needed, the very fact of knowing that errors occurred in a particular section of the test helps the pupil to take extra care as he approaches that skill development on the next language level. After the item analysis and score sheet has been added to the previous test notes and the teacher has made her statement and added the agreed programme of extra practice to the summary scheet, the pupil is asked if he wishes to have a comment recorded about the test or his performance on it. Set in the context of the constructive discussion surrounding the test, this opportunity affords the pupil a chance to be openly self-critical and gives self-respect and dignity to the pupil.

Pupil records at our school are confidential: they used to be secret. During our review of assessment procedures, there was a consensus amongst the staff that a pupil's

school notes should be made available for his parents to see. We took this a stage further by making a decision, based upon our experience with the language assessment, to make our notes available to the pupil himself. A contributory factor to this decision was our view of the pupil as a person capable of self determination and deserving of the right to information which enabled him to exercise this capacity. We followed this decision by taking the next logical step which was to provide the opportunity for children and parents to add to these school notes. The position now is that the three parties most closely concerned with a child's education, namely the pupil, the parents and the teacher, work together to produce a vital, worthwhile, working document.

Additional Associated Changes:

1. The effectiveness of the pupil-involved assessment in language development spurred us on to consider other curricular areas which might benefit from such evaluation. Over recent months we have devised skill assessment sheets on numeracy which will also be jointly marked by both pupil and teacher and will incorporate provision for the pupil to make a personal comment.

2. As time passed and the language programme was extended to more and more pupils, our use of the Schonell Graded Reading Vocabulary Test became increasingly inappropriate. Children taught to use contextual cues in reading were unlikely to benefit from a test which asked them to read words taken out of context. In reviewing our need for reading assessment which was not linked to our language programme, we found ourselves asking whether this was a form of testing intended to benefit the pupil directly, or to confirm the effectiveness of our language teaching. We decided to continue such evaluation only if an appropriate test could be found. After looking for a test which closely approximated actual reading behaviour, we eventually decided to try a test based on Cloze procedure, to be administered to the older children.

As a result of the change which took place in our language scheme, we have developed individual, pupil-involved assessment and progress records. Our experience leads us to believe that we are helping our pupils towards their full potential by directing effort to where it is most needed and by enabling self criticism to be channelled to constructive ends. Evaluation based on relevance to the individual pupil will certainly be the keynote of the future assessment procedures of our school.

Implications for the Future of Education

Although the present example is drawn from a first school, it has implications for all sectors of compulsory and non-compulsory education, for it illustrates the constructive aspect of assessment. At our school we have learnt the value of formative assessment as a teaching/learning tool through practical experience. We are not alone in our discovery of the advantages of formative assessment. Across the country there are teachers in all types of schools and colleges striving hard to help their pupils towards constructive self-criticism and personal insight. The efforts of these forward thinking teachers are frequently frustrated by the demands made and the constraints imposed by school report systems and terminal examinations. We cannot ignore the fact that the present system of summative assessment we have in this country lacks relevance for a large proportion of school pupils and it serves the needs of all children poorly. In looking for more worthwhile methods of school evaluation we must study priorities with care and ensure that the needs of the pupil are not overlooked. The collaborative evaluation of a pupil's work could be the start of a movement to take education back to the child. If the current trend of school-based development continues, it is reasonable to predict that assessment will become increasingly school based and pupil oriented. Only through such a change in direction shall we capitalise on the high degree of latent self-criticism within schools. As educators, we may have to resist the temptation to satisfy our own need for output statistics in favour of a more relevant and valid

form of educational evaluation.

One of the implications of involving pupils in assessing their own work is that it could lead to a change in the style of education. If ta-en to its logical conclusion, assessment, by providing feedback, could become the initiator of radically different programmes of education, and result in schools becoming education centres in the widest sense of the term. There is no doubt that by providing for pupil participation in assessment, the education system would become accountable in the most direct form to its clients and through parent involvement, to a large section of the public. The democratic and consultative style of leadership now appearing in many schools will form a sound background from which to attempt this different style of evaluation. Teachers who have trust and confidence given to their decision making are capable of showing trust and confidence in the contribution of pupils and their parents. An adventurous leadership, questioning of the existing administrative practice and capable of devising systems flexible enough to incorporate pupil individuality, will grow and develop through preparing for and attempting such innovation.

Radical changes in the education system at 'grass roots' level to focus more attention on the pupil, his needs and the relevance of his education in a changing society, could well be the most exciting educational happening this century. Resulting from it would be parents who were educationally aware and increasingly confident in their role as participants in educational decision making, and teachers whose broadened professionality enables them to apply critical and openminded judgement in favour of their pupils, and to show trust in their fellow decision makers. But the most important outcome of all would be a young person conscious of his own potential and possessor of an honest and healthy self image.

References

Adams, B. and T. Burgess (1980), Outcomes of Education. Macmillan Education.

Nisbet, J. (1974), "Innovation - bandwagon or hearse?" reprinted in A. Harris et al (1975), Curriculum Innovation. Croom Helm, pp.3-6.

Scott Foresman Reading Systems (1971). Scott, Foresman and Co.

Schonell, F.J. and F.E. Schonell (1950), Diagnostic and Attainment Testing. Oliver and Boyd.

THE EDUCATION AUDIT AS A MONITOR OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

W.F. Dennison

School of Education
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne

The quality of performance of an educational institution has always been an issue, but until recently most concerns were satisfied by intuitive and subjective judgements. The parent, the teacher, the potential employer, the LEA offical, among others, all make choices based on implicit premises that, for example, one school is better than another; but up to now these decisions have had to rely on hunch and to some extent prejudice. There are, therefore, some pressures from those closely associated with the system for definitive indications of relative institutional performance (DES 1977a). Alongside this movement there are demands originating from a different source, but propelling the system in the same direction, for a more systematic evaluation of all public services. This latter element is a global movement complementing rising government expenditures in relation to low levels of total economic growth, and increasing public awareness of the effects of spending commitments and the resultant foregone opportunities (Hatry, 1974). The real surprise is not the emergence of these dual factors, but that it was not until the late 1960s that they generated any momentum. In fact, it is possible that the systematic study of educational performance might have been relegated to a low agenda position, had it not been for the economic retrenchment of the 1970s, the resultant analysis of many public institutions; and the not unrelated and strident demands for reform and increased accountability

within the education system (DES 1977b). The lack of consensus about educational aims and objectives, the role of education in community evaluation, the intangibility of outputs, the effects on individual human development, and the timelags between effort and effect, are all pertinent and persuasive themes in the argument that educational activities are different, and therefore demand a separate consideration, as compared to other components of the public sector.

However, the demands for systematic appraisal exist and require some satisfaction. Although demand satisfaction is not the sole priority in the design of an appraisal framework, it is an important factor, and requires some knowledge of the intentions supporting evaluatory pressures. In the first place there is a quite natural perception that certain decisions, whether of a parent and a child choosing a particular school or a LEA committee allocating resources, would be better served by the sort of information evaluatory mechanisms might provide. In other words there is an informational feedforward and feedback need affecting all those personnel, both professional and lay, who make decisions associated with the system. Second, there are the motivations supporting the view that educationists and their educational activities, along with all other parts of the public economy, must be subject, as they have not been previously, to a continuous and rigorous scrutiny; with opinions ranging from a crude and undefined 'value for money' argument, to the concern with the potential advantages of improved informational flows to system decision-making. At this point the intentions, to some extent the audience, but not the origins, of the accountability strand of evaluation are indistinguishable from the information strand.

Conditions for Successful Monitoring

While the appeasement of the most hard-line 'accountability for its own sake' advocates is not feasible, the first and most obvious condition for the successful monitoring of

performance is that the demands and perceptions initiating consideration of evaluatory processes must in a democracy be satisfied. The attentions of proponents of evaluatory procedures, particularly those outside the system, can be diverted by insider activities, but ultimately if sufficient interest is maintained, and the strength of the political lobby remains, the system must respond. However in direct contrast, so powerful are the interest groups within the system that whatever mechanisms and arrangements are devised they must complement the existing pattern of relationships, and in particular the distribution of powers and responsibilities that has evolved. This is the second condition: and while it does not imply that the current system arrangements will not be affected by the introduction of evaluative strategies, so great is the potential for controversy and dissonance that evaluative developments will need to be seen as the result, not the cause of change. The third condition, if monitoring is to be successful, is the need for a clear understanding of the intentions of evaluative procedures and a reasonable degree of consensus, inside and outside the system, over these intentions and the methods to be employed. Here it is not the vague terminology of efficiency, performance and achievement, but the more precise concept of institutional effectiveness which will be used - the relationships between inputs and outputs achieved within the framework of goal specifications and in the context of a working environment.

Considering these conditions together, and with the constraints imposed by the nature of the educative process, the available options for institutional evaluation are few. They are further limited by the particular characteristics of the education system to which the adopted strategy is to be applied; and in English education the vital factor is institutional autonomy. It is the school or the department which delineates, usually implicitly, aims and objectives and then determines the process details. This is a fact which cannot be ignored. There are the constraints

of central and local finance, of examination board syllabuses, of the work of training institutions and advisory staff, and many other external factors; but the detailed intentions and arrangements of the individual institution are decided in staff rooms, not in LEA offices or DES headquarters. Therefore, whether one refers to process or product evaluation, imposed solutions are wrong, not in a conceptual or theoretical sense, but because they are at variance with the power structure of the system. At present, for example, LEAs have neither the political will nor probably the technical expertise to detail aims and objectives and the resultant curricular arrangements for their secondary schools; and any school can quite rightly claim that evaluative measures chosen for it are irrelevant, because the selected criteria do not match the aims, objectives and processes it is allowed to decide for itself. Nationally, the Assessment of Performance Unit, even with the curricular model it has introduced (Kay, 1976), runs into similar problems; for the performances to be assessed are the knowledge and skills it regards as important, and there is no mechanism currently available to ensure that Unit views and priorities coalesce with those of individual schools. It is also of little value suggesting that the imposition of external criteria might provice a viable evaluation mechanism if restricted to a part of a school's activity; for example, reading schemes in the junior school or external examination performance in the secondary school. All this means is that some parts of the curriculum would be regarded as more important than others, because items there are subject to external evaluation.

The Audit

If the monitoring of institutional effectiveness is itself to be effective, in the present organisation of the system, then by far the most important factor which emerges is the need for a strong self-evaluatory component. Equally, if the demands of the proponents of evaluation are to be

satisfied, particularly those outside the system, there is need for some form of external validation of any self-evaluation. The best model in these circumstances is provided by the audit within accountancy. That is the methodical and systematic review of the whole situation associated with the institution, the production of an annual report by institutional staff, and an assessment of the validity of this report by an independent panel.

What is required is much more than the vague set of intentions, the intuitive estimates of performance and, perhaps, the list of external examination results, which typically constitute the headteacher's speech day survey or annual report to governors. The successful audit would present a specific set of institutional aims and objectives, reviewed annually in response to findings both about the processes adopted in their pursuit and relative levels of achievement, in the context of the total environment of the school (the catchment area, the availability of resources, central and local education policies, and the economic climate). It would cover the whole spectrum of school activities, curricular and extra-curricular, and range from highly quantifiable product evaluations (test reading scores of remedial groups, for example) to the subjective consideration of process (the value of a programme in creative arts). In secondary schools much of the detail of evaluation and review would be performed on a departmental or house basis. A simple statement of public examination results would be inadequate. The design of the junior science course is based on certain intentions and whether they, and progress towards them, are reviewed in terms of test scores, pupil numbers in subsequent option groups, the subjective attitudinal changes resulting from a curriculum development project, or a combination of all three, is a matter which staff of the individual school must resolve. Some schools will emphasise extra-curricular activities, others high academic achievement; but it is for the respective staffs to explain their priorities and goals, and then demonstrate their effectiveness.

The Scheme in Practice

The scheme as outlined raises two practical issues of immense significance. The first involves the role of the teaching profession. Far from reducing institutional autonomy and professional freedom the audit of effectiveness strengthens both, by adding the responsibilty for establishing evaluatory procedures at school level to the power over curricular detail which teachers already possess. However, this new responsibility will involve more work, and it would be naive to assume that adequate teacher commitment to this work will evolve naturally in every school situation. There will be a need for some stimulus of the sort that could be provided by the falling school rolls situation. In an adverse demographic climate it will be difficult for many schools to maintain staffing levels; but if they can demonstrate that otherwise surplus staff time is being properly used to monitor institutional effectiveness, and by this improve system decision-making, then a compromise between the accountability and staff reduction demands of system critics, and the needs of teachers threatened by redundancy, can be achieved.

The second issue concerns the independence and the competence of the audit panel. With such an influential self-evaluatory component there is clearly a need for a strong external validation mechanism. If not, then at the least, the accountability origins of evaluatory pressures cannot possibly be satisfied, and at the worst the whole exercise could develop powerful self-congratulatory overtones. Therefore, each report will be studied and commented upon by panel members who between them are able to supply information about the school and its activities, yet who are, in the main, separate from it; and who also know something of the education system, its processes, and its role in local, regional and national development. Obviously this will involve both a lay and a professional membership, and while the servicing of the panels would be provided by the LEA, it could not, from its own resources of members and officers, supply the range and strength of expertise

necessary to fill all the panels. Then, either the LEA sets up a specially constituted set of panels, with all the associated problems of introducing a totally new structure into the relationship with schools, or it turns to the audit panels which already exist in embryo - the managing and governing bodies of schools. As presently constituted in most LEAs governing bodies have neither the experience nor the knowledge to function as audit panels. However, the Taylor Committee (DES 1977c) argued convincingly for radical membership change and searched for new functions to complement this change. The two aspects cannot be considered independently, for the new members will only be attracted if the functional responsibilities are sufficiently attractive. A development, such as the audit, with governors validating the effectiveness monitor of the school staff, would both allow the new governors to enhance their role and enable staff to extend their professional responsibilities.

References

DES (1977a), Education in Schools: a Consultative Document. HMSO, p.17.

DES (1977b), Educating Our Children: Four Subjects for Debate. HMSO.

DES (1977c), A New Partnership for our Schools. HMSO.

Hatry, H.P. (1974), "Measuring the quality of urban management," inW.D. Hawley and D. Rodger (eds), Improving the Quality of Urban Management. London: Sage Publications.

EVALUATING SCHOOLS AND THEIR MANAGEMENT: DEVELOPMENTS IN SOLIHULL

Mark W. Hewlett

Headmaster
Heart of England School
Solihull

This paper describes an attempt to design an instrument (Solihull Education Department, 1979), (a) to analyse educational and management processes in schools; and (b) to enable evaluation to be undertaken in a thorough and systematic but at the same time simple and constructive way, by those in the schools.

The Solihull handbook was designed for internal consumption, to improve the performance of educational and management tasks within schools, rather than to provide a means of rendering the schools accountable to external agents, although it could also be used for this purpose. Despite growing awareness of benefits to be derived from more thorough evaluation, reflected in an increasing volume of relevant literature, it seemed that the impact of developments upon school practice had been negligible, for two main reasons:

(a) The inadequate nature of the material available which with only a very few exceptions, tends to be too discursive, incomplete, or too generalised; there is virtually nothing which as it stands is of direct use to teachers.

(b) Its failure to deal with the practical organisational problems of how to introduce and support school evaluation on an effective and continuing basis.

It was felt that from the practitioner's point of view quite enough had been written by way of general outlines,

methodological and case study. What seemed to be required was some attempt to take properly into account the reality of life in schools where teachers, many of them able and interested, and aware of the possibilities of improvement, do not have the time or experience to undertake the arduous and complex task of designing their own management and evaluation systems.

Suggested Criteria for Effective Evaluation

In planning the scheme of evaluation to be put into practice in Solihull, attention was kept firmly focussed upon the school situation and the potential needs and responses of teachers. It was considered that as far as possible the evaluation document should achieve the following:

1. It should be detailed and explicit, providing a systematic framework for a comprehensive in-depth analysis of the whole range of tasks affecting the work of the whole school and its component parts (e.g. subject departments, pastoral units), in particular:

   (a) designed to assist analysis of:
   - broad policy aspects;
   - middle order 'executive' aspects;
   - operational aspects including the many routine, mundane and apparently trivial tasks;

   (b) concerned with both instrumental aspects (e.g. resources, timetabling) and affective aspects (making explicit the importance of social relations and personal characteristics);

   (c) concerned with both management/organisational aspects and more obviously educational ones (including for example methods of analysing the quality of classroom teaching);

   (d) applicable to staff at all levels in the school;

   (e) presented in a clear meaningful framework providing a useful conceptual tool to clarify thinking about the whole structure and context of school management.

2. It should be convenient and practicable, bearing in mind the perspectives, attitudes and priorities of teachers, in particular:

   (a) designed so as to be usable as it stands without the need for the time-consuming and arduous process of translation, re-arrangement and adaptation;

   (b) couched in clear, straightforward language;

   (c) suitable for self evaluation either by individuals or groups, and for evaluation by external agents;

   (d) incorporating a convenient means of recording responses to identify strengths and weaknesses and to record suggestions for improvement;

   (d) incorporating a clear explanation of the purpose of evaluation.

3. It should positively promote personal and professional growth, being designed to:

   (a) suggest an ideal (without being narrowly prescriptive);

   (b) facilitate constructive dialogue between staff;

   (c) lead explicitly to consideration of appropriate in-service work;

   (d) provide a possible structure for objective research and enquiry (e.g. to enable comparative study of the priorities, needs and problems of different departments, experienced and inexperienced staff, or of different schools).

4. In addition to the above criteria, which apply particularly to the nature of the evaluation document which is the <u>basis</u> for evaluation, it is considered that careful attention should be given to the introduction, sponsorship and continuing support of the evaluation programme: in particular that it should:

   (a) be introduced afer careful explanation of its purpose and value so as to be understood and accepted by all concerned;

(b) actively involve not only school staff at all levels but external agents able to offer objective judgement, expert advice and/or active support, particularly LEA advisers, but also, depending on the circumstances, others such as governors and academics.

(c) be organised so that those outside the school are seen to act in a positive and constructive way, and not primarily in a critical inspectorial capacity.

(d) take place in a regular formalised way, incorporated as an integral part of the school's management.

Distinctive Characteristics of the Solihull Scheme

1. Perhaps the most distinctive contribution of the handbook is the section on "Organisation and Management" which is an attempt to translate management concepts into practical terms within the school environment. Although the classification of management functions is problematical it seemed desirable to present a general conceptual framework to clarify and systematise thinking about the wide variety of tasks involved in running a school.

2. It was a deliberate choice in reaching a compromise between the advantages of simplicity and brevity, and a possibly daunting detailed guide. One which did not consider detailed practicalities including some of the routine minutiae, would be a waste of time and leave the evaluation at too generalised a level.

3. Questions are posed on potentially sensitive issues. For example, the following questions are included (in slightly different wording): Is there a lack of drive and enthusiasm in your department? Is the head/head of department aggressive, indifferent or over-bearing? Is the routine administration disorganised, frequently causing irritation and confusion?

An important test of management is how it deals with the difficult, sensitive issues often connected with individual

attitudes and social relations. An argument in favour of a handbook or manual is that it provides a means of bringing to the surface difficult problems which otherwise tend to be ignored or are solved at the risk of provoking possibly damaging confrontation.

4. Strong emphasis is placed upon positive aspects of evaluation. In the Handbook this is done explicitly by stating the object of evaluation, including its function in promoting constructive discussion; and implicitly in suggesting the various practical ways in which the handbook might be used (e.g. for self evaluation).

The positive framework is designed to promote an active and positive response by, in effect, posing the following questions for each task: (i) how important is it? (ii) how effective has been the performance of this task? (iii) what, if anything, needs to be done? (iv) what help would be useful?

5. The section on In-Service Education places yet further emphasis on the need to think constructively and imaginatively about professional development. The handbook as a whole may be seen as a tool for in-service education; indeed at one stage it was considered entitling the handbook "School Management: a Framework for In-Service Education".

6. It is appreciated that the criteria and indeed the whole method of approach adopted in Solihull may be regarded as suspect, for at least two reasons. It is argued that evaluation (or any form of innovation) is likely to be more effective if it is generated by the teachers involved who can thus ensure that it is relevant to their own particular needs. Fears have been expressed that externally imposed systems might foist on schools an inappropriate model which could render the evaluation ineffective or counter-productive. Additionally, if teachers devise their own system they will be more fully committed to it. However, as mentioned above, the task of devising satisfactory evaluation systems is time consuming

and quite difficult; the number of schools where such developments will arise spontaneously is probably very small. It is considered that the nature of the task specification and the flexibility built into the Handbook in particular by posing throughout the question "How important is this task?" hopefully encouraging a critical response, will obviate as far as possible the danger of falling into the "trap ... of prescribing universal management principles to planned organisational change" (Davies, 1973).

Although the evaluation system does, perhaps, imply a particular style of management, the ways in which it can be used, as described in its introduction, are so varied that it should not lead to imposing an alien system which would harm existing practice. Moreover it was considered that insofar as it might appear to prescribe a particular method it would in the vast majority of cases be an alternative only to intuitive, ad hoc methods which would hardly be damaged by having attention drawn to the tasks of management and teaching in a more systematic way. Furthermore, even if there were defects these could later be remedied.

Origin, Sponsorship and Current Developments of the Solihull Scheme

The Handbook arose out of informal discussions In January 1978, between Colin Humphrey, Director of Education, who had been considering introducing some form of systematic evaluation, and the writer, who having prepared the basis of the Handbook, was interested in finding an outlet beyond his own school. The way it arose might have something to do with the small size of the Solihull Authority and the effects of this on the relationship between the "office" and the schools.

A working party comprising four headteachers, three assistant teachers and three LEA inspectors was established. During seven sessions the proposals for the Handbook were discussed, refin-d and edited. One of these sessions was devoted to

discussion with one of the ILEA inspectors responsible for Keeping the School Under Review (ILEA, 1977). After printing (in July 1979), copies were distributed to all Solihull secondary heads, who attended a meeting addressed by the Director to launch the Handbook and to receive views as to how it might most effectively be used. At this stage it was decided to let it 'float'; copies were distributed to schools to use in any way they thought appropriate. To date, all heads except one have expressed the view that it is potentially useful, and most have used parts of it; however, as they have used different parts and in different ways, no clear pattern has emerged.

Possibilities for General Research and Enquiry With Reference to Findings Obtained from Materials in the Solihull Handbook

Quantified responses of groups of staff (using the response framework) can produce objective findings valuable both internally within the school and possibly externally, for example in comparing the performances of different schools in relation to known variables. Within the school it is obviously useful to obtain the collective view of the whole staff or of groups of staff (e.g. probationer teachers) on priorities, strengths and weaknesses. Findings indicate adjustments which might be made to the organisation of the school and be used as a basis for designing in-service programmes. The most obvious information to obtain concerns those aspects which are perceived to be both important and defective. The response frameworks provide opportunity for rating the importance and the performance of each task on a basic four point scale.

Partly by way of testing materials for the Handbook, staff in three schools were asked to respond to 52 items covering a wide range of management and teaching tasks; these items have subsequently been re-arranged and incorporated into several sections of the Handbook.

From the findings it was readily identified that at Heart of England School, while the most successful aspects of the school's work were considered by staff to be (1) the quality of routine administration; (2) support given to staff in matters of discipline; and (3) efforts made to sustain a feeling of unity and mutual support amongst the staff; the main deficiencies - which were more useful to establish - lay in (1) lack of guidance in connection with teachers' own career development; (2) lack of guidance in the design of effective standardised testing procedures and other aspects of pupil diagnosis and assessment, (3) lack of co-ordination and linkage between departments, (4) lack of opportunity and encouragement to learn by watching others teach (mentioned particularly by junior staff), and (5) lack of discussion on new teaching developments (e.g. role play, simulation, educational games). Whereas some of these deficiencies were patently obvious to senior staff (e.g. item 1), others were not.

The findings have been used in various forms of organisational readjustment (e.g. using the three deputy heads as co-ordinators of subject groups), in establishing a curriculum development group (specifically requested by staff) connected to timetable consultation procedures, and in various forms of in-service work.

References

Davies, J. (1973), "Management by objectives in local education authorities and educational establishments", Educational Administration Bulletin, vol.2, no.1, p.38.

ILEA (1977), Keeping the School Under Review. ILEA.

Solihull Education Department (1979), Evaluating the School: a Guide for Secondary Schools in the Metropolitan Borough of Solihull. This is available from the Director of Education, Council House, Solihull.

EVALUATION AT GREAT BARR SCHOOL

K. Lambert

Headmaster
Great Barr School
Birmingham

This paper is an account of a process of school evaluation at Great Barr School, Birmingham, between 1974 and 1979.

Great Barr School has an enrolment of 1950 boys and girls between the ages of 11 and 18, and is situated on the northern boundary of the City adjacent to Walsall and West Bromwich.

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss staff development per se it is our belief that no process of school evaluation can be effective without a prior programme of staff development. We regard staff morale and the concept of organisational health as fundamental, and maintain a statistical base of data to assist in the assessment of organisational health. The statistical data includes such aspects as staff sickness rate, age-sex structure of staff, experience and qualifications of staff, pupil attendance and lateness, truancy, the level of participation in extra curricular activities, the rate of homework return, the level of vandalism and graffiti, numbers of pupils before the Courts, the incidence of parental and community complaints, parental support for parents' meetings and functions, parental comments on pupils' reports, the efficiency of the communications system, and resource distribution. If an organisation is not in good health then no innovation is likely to be successful, the analogy being that of a human organ transplant which may suffer tissue rejection if the human body is not in good health. Hence the approach to

school evaluation was gradual and based upon staff morale and organisational health. Further, it had to be based on the credibility of the head and the senior staff, and the development of a feeling of mutual trust between them and the remainder of the staff. Indeed the whole exercise of evaluation which inevitably involves appraisal must be seen in positive terms of support for the teacher in the classroom as well as constructive criticism and the joint search for solutions.

In consequence the work on evaluation commenced with the appointment of a new deputy head with special responsibility for staff development and training. Another newly appointed deputy was charged with the responsibility for curriculum evaluation which would run concurrently with the staff development programme. The head's role was to examine overall the effectiveness of the school's objectives, policies, standards, procedures and control systems in relation to a five year development plan drawn up in 1974. It was recognised that there would be problems in evaluation, not least that of the ambiguity of outcomes; and it was desirable that clear and definable outcomes should be set out wherever possible. Further, the decision makers had to be familiar with data handling rather than using the intuitive or 'seat of the pants' approach. Care had also to be exercised with emotional involvement as a result of which there is always a tendency to attempt to explain away negative evaluation results.

The first step was to set about defining the role of the head of department and this was done after discussions with heads of departments. A series of criteria were agreed on the basis of which the performance of heads of departments could be evaluated. The evaluation would take place at regular meetings between the deputy head in charge of curriculum and the head of department. Although some of the criteria might seem trivial it must be remembered that this was a first step, and that although seemingly trivial they could be a good guide as to what is happening in a department. The criteria included such matters as the general care of books, both exercise and text, the level of presentation of pupils' work

in exercise books, completeness of marking, the setting of adequate classwork and regular homework, the general appearance of classrooms and level of display work, the adequacy of staff records, the supervision of probabioners, departmental objectives, extra curricular activities and movements towards curriculum reform.

At the same time the Head has the practice of calling in one year's expercise books in one sucject each Friday for scrutiny. His findings were then discussed with the deputy and head of department and positive or negative comments were made. This practice has continued.

About this time, homework diaries were re-introduced for pupils in which all homework had to be entered. These were examined by the deputy and by heads of houses, individual pupil defaulters were chased and where there were entries of 'not set' this was followed up by heads of departments.

The deputy head (staff) was about this time drawing up job specifications with evaluation criteria, after discussions with the staff concerned, for all staff in scale 2 posts or above. Allied to this were a series of staff courses for probationers, middle management, and junior teachers. A series of appraisal interviews for probationers with the head and deputy was also introduced and these resulted in much feedback from probationers on ways in which the system could be improved.

The next step was a large one and when introduced staff had to be convinced that it was a positive constructive step and not a negative critical one. This was the system of departmental reviews which are essentially 'general inspections' of departments over a thre or four week period by the senior staff. A preliminary discussion between the deputy and the head of department ascertains basic information such as resources, staff qualifications, rooms, equipment, A.V. aids, capitation and budgeting. The syllabus is re-examined, records of work studied, and the departmental communications system examined. Departments regularly submit agenda and

minutes of all departmental meetings to the head. A timetable of visits is prepared for senior staff by the head of department and lessons are then viewed. Criteria are set out for assessing lessons and we shall be reviewing these shortly. The lesson is then discussed with the individual teacher and a written report sent by the reviewer to the deputy. These reports are later destroyed in the presence of the head of department. The senior management team then draft a report on the department which is discussed with the head of department, and an agreed report given to the departmental meeting at which all members of the reviewing team are present and at which lively discussion takes place. There are lessons in the report usually for individual teachers, for the head of department and for the organisation of the school as a whole. There is a follow-up procedure over the next twelve months. There are usually two or three reviews each term. The last review by the senior management team was of the school objectives for the next five year plan.

A further form of evaluation has been that of the so-called 'difficult class'. When a head of house has repeated reports that a particular class is 'difficult' he may ask the senior team to undertake a 'class review'. The team call a meeting of all teachers of that class, listen to the problem as outlined, which usually consists of a list of difficult children, only a few of whom are common to all teachers. For one week every lesson is covered in whole or part by a member of the senior team and attempts are made to isolate the problems. Sometimes it becomes evident that a pupil is difficult because he is not being stretched or is out of his depth and transfer to another class is recommended. Sometimes it results in referral to the Psychological Service who may hold a meeting for all teachers with the educational psychologist who has seen the child, to discuss the best ways of dealing with him. At times it is evident that the class is being exposed to too much teaching, which although conscientious, lacks sparkle and it appears to us that that beyond about one-third of a timetable of this kind

can lead to a difficult class. Hence there is need for care in staff allocation overall to classes. Class reviews have proved valuable and all classes reviewed have shown marked improvement. Where children have been found to be difficult there have been meetings with the parents in every case.

Two years ago a new system of assessment grids for pupil progress and evaluation, which are conducted five times yearly, was introduced. These provide a monitoring device for heads of houses and a statistical analysis devised by a member of the mathematics department recently will enable us to quantify progress or regression. It also unearths curiosities such as the class where all boys regressed over a term, and all girls progressed. Then we must ask why.

Future progress will lie in the revision of job specifications, the increase in the practice of job rotation, a revision of departmental review processes, a new staff record system, the development of appraisal interviews for all staff, an attainment monitoring of a statistical sample of pupils throughout the school, some competency testing in basics in years four and five, we hope some co-operation with the Open University on evaluation, and the implementation of our new five year plan with the newly defined objectives and their preference scale.

SELF EVALUATION FOR THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

An Interim Description of Pilot Instruments and Some Initial Reactions and Problems Revealed in Their Use.

Geoffrey Lyons

Principal Lecturer in Education Management
Anglian Regional Management Centre

There is an increasing interest expressed in the evaluation of schools. Self evaluation as a technique, although only one means of of evaluation, and posing many problems to issues of evaluation generally debated, has attractiveness.

A working party of Essex Inspectors and secondary Head-teachers, and two members of staff of the Anglian Regional Management Centre, have designed three experimental documents which simplify evaluation processes, give a firm replicable structure to work from, and lend themselves to the school regularly reviewing its organisational processes. These are briefly discussed below. Initial field reactions give sufficient encouragement to suggest that further development of the pilot instruments will be fruitful.

The technique suggested here offers a facility for continuous enquiry and review of a school's strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies or under developed areas; it also encourages a school to seek its own solutions and to implement them. The technique is intended to assist schools in the process of self assessment by enabling them to:

(a) assess the value of existing arrangements and practices;
(b) determine whether change or additions are needed;
(c) adjust to new pressures or ideas.

It does so by placing an emphasis upon 'how' the self

evaluation takes place and upon the outcomes of the exercise.

The early pilot documents have focussed upon evaluation of the 'tasks' the school undertakes. The intention is to offer a school a process through which the assessment of the various aspects of its work and organisation can be carried out; one that will enable it, for example, to review its aims and objectives, its staff development programme, its careers education and guidance programme, and so forth. The enquiries and discussions which result from the application of the process will identify the issues, problems, areas, details, on which decisions or actions may need to be taken.

Each document in the instrument deals with one particular topic set out in stages. Each stage included key questions and presents suggested examples and evidence which will allow the key questions to be answered. The determining of whether an aspect of work thus being scrutinised is at an acceptable level or not, is the school's own. Additionally, sets of questions are appended to each document. These are intended to draw the school's attention to those aspects of the topic which are likely to be of general concern, and which should be considered before any review of existing arrangements is undertaken. The questions are not meant to present an exhaustive list and schools should add other questions which are more appropriate to their particular requirements.

Although the documents can be worked through by an individual, the real benefit will accrue from group or whole staff involvement. To ensure the most effective use of the documents it is advisable to induct staff into the procedure; to gain their goodwill, their co-operation, their belief that the process will result in action, and their commitment to it. The document called the Preliminary Enquiry should be regarded as an important pre-requisite to this, and it is assumed here that a school will begin the self-assessment process by using the Preliminary Enquiry.

It may well be the case that there are schools that have already undertaken a similar type of preliminary exercise, particularly through the use of an in-service training day, and they may wish from the outset to turn to the other documents which deal more specifically with aspects of the school's work. There is, of course, no reason why they should not do this.

Factors Affecting the Process of Self Assessment

Attitudes

The process is not intended to produce complacency, to introduce divisiveness or to increase introspection, but to be positive, constructive, forward looking, and to develop confidence and assuredness.

There is need for openness, for a co-operative approach and common aims and aspirations. Used constructively the process should benefit everyone through increased awareness, efficiency and planning.

Time

The process can be used for quick, cursory assessments or reviews, or in a more detailed and protracted way. The more thorough the exercise the better the results and the effects.

Priorities

After completing the Preliminary Enquiry schools will have to determine which aspects of their work need attention and decide on priorities. When a particular aspect has been assessed action may again depend upon establishing priorities, and on resources.

Subjectivity

Objective criteria will not necessarily exist for helping to determine the value or quality of what a school wishes to do. Examples from existing practice can, however,

be used as indicators, and some are included on the process sheets. Schools should seek out and add others which will be of particular relevance to their own unique requirements.

Aims and Objectives

The process of self evaluation can only be meaningful if the proposals or plans that emerge fit defined aims and objectives. It follows, therefore, that a school must be clear as to what are its aims and objectives.

Some Disadvantages of Self Assessment

Whilst arguing that a school should be encouraged to assess itself, and some of the advantages have been outlined above, it cannot be denied that disadvantages exist in the very nature of self assessment.

A considerable amount of teacher time is involved, for all levels of staff. It can prove a slow process, and it can become a burden added to the existing workloads of staff already over committed. There is always the possibility in any self-administered evaluation process of an irrational reaction being allowed to override objectivity, that staff which stick to the form rather than to the spirit of the intention, or that key aspects of a school's activities might be omitted from analysis. Self evaluation done badly might increase complacency, be divisive amongst staff, increase introspection, all of which run counter to the real aims of self assessment. It might also fail to satisfy pressures from outside for 'accountability', unless some way can be found of giving comparability to the information produced by a school, which may well run counter to the 'philosophy' of self assessment. Problems of role, authority and the involvement of staff in the decision making process may initially also cause problems in some schools. Ambiguity exists to some extent in precisely what self assessment actually means, as well as for whom it is being undertaken; it can, for example, prove difficult to demonstrate to a sceptical staff the benefits which will accrue to the children from the use of the process, or that

it is not a 'backdoor' inspection, and so forth. It is difficult in the short term to show what are the real costs, or if there are any side effects. What the advantages or disadvantages may be in the long run will of course only emerge over time.

Many of the factors indicated above will of course be resolved through a wider and more systematic use of the process. However substantial issues do arise about the generation of criteria - upon which assessment can be based, and about issues concerned with correctly identifying the underlying causes of problems and not dealing with their symptoms. As far as the latter point is of concern, benefits would accrue to a school if it felt able to use an external agent(s) - colleagues from other schools, local education authority advisers, and so forth. However, the issue of the generation of criteria must be tackled. It seems self evident that staff must accept and internalise the criteria which are to be used, for any attempt to impose them from outside may become counter productive. The criteria generated must be in harmony with the school's aims and objectives and not antithetical to its values. The most effective way of ensuring this comes about is to gain the commitment of staff through wide ranging discussion of the issues of concern in their school.

The Preliminary Enquiry

It became very obvious that there was a need for a document which would help a school with the issues and problems which would arise the first time it undertook the formal self evaluation exercise: it helps to induct or socialize staff into the process. This document became known as the Preliminary Enquiry. This document fulfils a number of functions:

- It attunes staff to the scope and type of enquiry intended, and gains their commitment to the procedure;

- It begins to generate criteria upon which self assessment can be based;
- It begins to generate information upon which a judgement will be based;
- It suggests channels by which information should be collected in order to make a judgement;
- It allows a wide ranging discussion on all aspects of the school's work it enables a more rapid focus to be made on to areas of subsequent concern;
- It provides the essential information which expedites the use of the other documents;
- One of the clearest features to emerge from the preliminary enquiry is the need for (most) schools to update the statement of their aims and objectives.

It is of interest that this document has subsequently generated a life of its own, as it were. It is an extremely simple, rapid and effective way of taking the 'temperature' of a school. It also forms an invaluable structure to an in-service training day.

A Process for Reviewing Aims and Objectives, and a Process for Reviewing Staff Development

These two documents adopt a common format. They are directed towards the Head and senior staff and are concerned with asking sets of key questions relating to ascertaining:

(a) the need for the school to review the particular aspect of organisation under scrutiny;

(b) information through a comprehensive set of questions which the school must convincingly answer before it can determine the answers to questions raised under (a) above.

The ability of the schools to provide convincing information in order to satisfy the questions raised, thus provides the answer to whether or not the school needs to review, in whole or in part, the aspect of the organisation being

examined. The decision is thus the school's own.

The intention is that the documents provide a framework easily replicated for most aspects of a school's organisation - the schools can produce their own documents, using the models provided. It is also intended that the use of the documents be cyclical in nature, with all aspects of the school's organisation being regularly reviewed.

The reactions to initial piloting of these documents suggest that further development and extensions into other areas of school organisation will be a worthwhile activity.

INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION AND COMPETENCY-BASED APPROACHES TO INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Lloyd E. McCleary

Iva D. McCleary

Department of Educational Administration
University of Utah

One avenue of institutional evaluation that shows promise of creating instruments and procedures for change within an institution itself, derives from competency-based forms of evaluation linked with the management tools of planning and controlling. The impetus to attempt the methodology presented here arises from evidence that the sources of greatest conflict and of obstruction to change attempts in the educational setting are:

1. Individual/sub-group disagreements over policies, rules and assignments - usually characterised as 'we against them' or 'us against the bureaucracy'.

2. Role conflict and role ambiguity arising from lack of sharing of role expectations and a lack of processes for adequate interaction to achieve clarification of tasks and responsibilities;

3. Power struggles resulting from protection of 'traditional' roles and activities and a lack of cooperative planning based upon rational goal determination;

4. Unclear lines of communication particularly in terms of those needed to influence decision-making, prioritizing of goals. and exercise of authority;

5. Responses to external requests and pressures due to lack of processes for external participation (inputs) to planning and evaluation.

Since education is highly dependent upon people, the focus of institutional change must center upon institutional planning, and role definition and performance evaluation related to it.

Two primary administrative functions under conditions of change are planning and controlling. Both depend upon adequate role definition and upon performance evaluation. Planning involves identification of needs, establishment of goals and programmes and their priorities, and the allocation of staff responsibilities. Planning is related to the achievement of goals and resolution of problems through administrative actions referred to as controlling. Controlling represents attempts to close the gap between needed and actual organisational achievement.

What individuals do and how they perform are the critical factors in determining the nature and quality of programmes. Thus, role definition and performance evaluation become basic administrative tools. However, care must be exercised that basic to an undertaking to define roles and evaluate performance is also a concern for the effects upon the people involved. Current theory holds that the institution is best served when the interests and development needs of the individual is a primary consideration (Argyris, 1967). The procedures used must meet the criterion that role definition and performance evaluation be conducted through processes acceptable to individuals such that both personal satisfaction and organisational effectiveness is improved.

The process of institutional change reported here begins with an Annual Plan (Plath, 1977). Teams of students, teachers, heads (department and school), parent and community agency representatives have input to the plan's development. Some techniques such as survey, problem inventory and brainstorming are used. Further description of the planning process cannot be presented here due to space considerations. However, over a two or three year

period institutional needs become clarified into long and short range goals; the process becomes known so that external and internal sources understand the procedures for their participation; and the needed resources and activities for altering conditions are clarified and tested.

Linking of Institutional Plans to
Role Definition and Performance Evaluation

With the institutional planning process established, role definition and performance evaluation can be undertaken using a system analysis format. System analysis (McClearly, Petersen, Lamb 1975) can be used for identifying goals, establishing priorities and allocating resources, specifying tasks and the competencies needed to achieve them, and setting time lines for task accomplishment. Here the Annual Plan provides goals and priorities. From these specific tasks can be specified in order to meet goals. Once tasks are delineated role definitions can be undertaken.

At the same time there are the regular, on-going programmes and responsibilities which make up the role expectations for teachers, counsellors, department chair-persons and principals. Using regular responsibilities plus the tasks delineated by planning, roles can be specified in competency terms. Individuals occupying a given role meet together and:

(a) identify the major areas of responsibility;
(b) write competency statements; and
(c) specify indicators of competency.

This information when shared across roles permits the identification of role conflict, role ambiguity and situation specific conditions.

Competency statements provide a functional role description. Here functional implies a level of generality such that those performing in the role and those who must relate to

it share an understanding of what is expected. At this point it is important to generate statements at a level of generality that the description contains as few items as possible which cover those competencies critical to the performance of the role. There are project reports which provide assistance and illustrations of the problems and the procedures (McClearly et al, (1979).

Generating the Ideal/Real Profiles

Statements of competency can be used as an instrument by placing a five point (likert-type) scale by each item. Responses in terms of importance obtained from those occupying the role, from superiors, and from subordinates can be analyzed. This step produces a profile of the role of the 'ideal'; that is, it identifies those competencies for which there is high agreement about generalized role expectations. It also identifies by low correlation measures, those areas of role ambiguity.

School by school comparisons with the ideal profile indicate both situation specific items (high agreement among raters by school, but low agreement with the total sample), and role conflict items. These items must be dealt with case by case.

After role ambiguity items are removed or recast and re-rated, the competency statements remaining are used in performance evaluation. The same scale is used to rate actual performance and 'actual' profiles are generated. A discrepancy analysis evaluation can be made of the comparisons between ideal and actual ratings. When ideal and actual ratings are grouped and averaged, comparisons are possible in what has come to be called the Quadrant Assessment Model (QAM).

The QAM reveals: (1) high-low ideal;
(2) high-low actual;
(3) high ideal - high actual;
(4) high ideal - low actual;

(5) low ideal - high actual;
(6) low ideal - low actual

measures of competence. For example, High Ideal - High Real statements are assumed to mean that competencies implied by the statements are important and that practitioners do, in fact, possess those competencies. Therefore, these statements would be important descriptions upon which to:

(a) evaluate performance of practitioners;
(b) determine entry level competencies for individuals assuming that role;
(c) base planning of pre-service programmes; and
(d) determine criteria for licensing.

On the other hand, Low Ideal - High Real statements are assumed to mean that competencies implied by the statements are of low importance and are regarded as over-emphasized in practice. Therefore, these statements would be important in assessing over-emphasis in performance and in discussing role definitions in in-service sessions. These competencies, unless further research indicates otherwise, would not be given priority in pre-service programmes or in licensing considerations.

Basic Steps of Methodology

The basic steps involved in methodology are:

1. Formation of task forces for initial input of role description in a systems formation;
2. Refinement of initial descriptions and a validity check.
3. Preparation of an instrument for the rating of role description items (competency statements); each statement is rated for importance using a Likert-type scale;
4. Collection of ideal ratings and preparation of the ideal profile - T-scores are used for prioritizing, high and low ideal items; W-correlation is used to validate items for use in performance evaluation;
5. Administration of same instrument for actual self and significant other ratings;

6. Preparation of actual profiles - individual and/or grouped data;

7. Analyses as needed, performance assessment, role definition and role clarification, conflict and situation specific items, need assessment for in-service etc.

The description of the methodology provides an indication of the power of the QAM and the uses to which it might be applied. This all too brief explanation of competency-based role specification and performance evaluation omits most of the technical details and practical problems which should be examined from sources cited before undertaking this approach.

Finally, five points should be made. First, performance evaluation does not eliminate judgement, and in this sense is not completely objective. Self and other ratings are judgemental in character and no pretence is made that the human factors involved in judgement are reduced to some objective basis. What is achieved is a framework for making judgements and a means for verification. Second, performance evaluation can be employed in a formative fashion with the participation of the person being evaluated. This is the most reasonable means of employing evaluation to enhance performance. Third, performance evaluation can be conducted so that both organizational goals and personal needs are taken into account. The means employed permits individual input to the items used, specified the process, included the individuals' self assessment and provided the data for a rational needs assessment. Fourth, the performance evaluation provides for role clarification, role conflict resolution and an acknowledgement of situation specific conditions. Finally, the process should be seen as incremental, to be conducted in regular cycles so that by successive use the process can be refined and improved.

ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT IN A COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

B.J. McGettrick

Vice-Principal
Notre Dame College of Education
Glasgow

This brief paper will look at how assessment of students in initial teacher education and assessment of their courses fits into a management scheme in a college of education, and is intended to raise some issues which are common to any institutional evaluation.

At the outset it is perhaps useful to suggest that assessment (and, avoiding problems of semantics, evaluation) will be considered to be the formal process of providing information in educational establishments. The purpose of providing this information should be to allow informed decisions to be taken.

With such a view of the purpose of assessment it is fairly obvious that there can be established a close link between assessment and the management of an institution. Indeed, the failure to have a strong link of this type might lead to a questioning of the purpose, nature and value of assessment, if it takes place at all.

Assessment for Student Progress

It would not be possible to try to set up any kind of optimum model for assessment of student progress in teacher education. The reasons for this will be obvious to anyone who has looked even casually at more than one teacher education establishment - there are almost as many executive

structures as institutions and probably each has a unique committee structure.

Table 1 below suggests examples of decisions and information needs which teacher training institutions must consider with respect to student assessment. Clearly some information is

Table 1. Information Needs for Decision Making

Examples of Decisions	Examples of Criteria Which May Be Used
Admissions	Academic qualifications Interview References (e.g. from schools)
Allocation to Classes (streaming, setting, banding, individualised learning)	Programme of course student to follow Academic background of student Geographical location of student's home Compatibility of staff and students
Progress through course and award of qualification	Information from (a) 'terminal' examinations (b) continuous assessment Counselling information 'Ad hoc' information

of value for more than one purpose, and for more than one decision, and there will be hierarchies of decisions taken by different people in different roles and in different committees. It is the function of management to ensure the smooth flow of all necessary information through the system, for the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of the institution.

Part of the evaluation of a college of education would be to ascertain what the purposes or aims of the institution were or were said to be, and on acknowledging the value and validity

of these, to examine the management structure which allows the aims to be achieved. Structures which are either unnecessary or inhibit the attainment of such aims form part of poor management. In this regard a number of questions may be asked of any teacher education establishment, such as: Does the Board of Examiners have the appropriate information on which to base decisions? Is the Academic Board a rubber-stamping committee in the field of student assessment? Are the relationships between committees effective? (the criteria for effectiveness would need to be articiulated).

The management of assessment is a particularly interesting area in institutional evaluation since it ought to be central to the organisation of students, of courses, and of resources. It is perhaps one in which many institutions might not do well. The difficulties of making assessment work are considerable, and include not only the management aspects but also such aspects as the assessment techniques being employed, the validity and reliability of the assessment data gathered, the attitudes of staff to certain types of data (in particular the acceptance of spurious measurements and the rejection of 'philosophical' data), and the ability of committees to come to informed judgements on the basis of various types of information, some of which may be conflicting.

Assessment for Course Development

The last ten years has seen an accellerating growth of course evaluation in all types of educational establishment. The extent of the recent literature on this topic is both a threat to anyone who wishes to embark on it, and an indicator of the value of the exercise. Where there does exist a structure for course assessment which is built into a management structure it often relates to a course committee, and is largely advisory in nature.

The very existence of a procedure for course assessment is itself interesting in evaluating an institution. The form

and effectiveness of the machinery is revealing, but it is often difficult to describe these aspects reliably since descriptions will depend on the perspective from which one views a course. It might well be assumed in the evaluation of an institution that has a management structure which promotes course assessment, that there is an openness, a democratic quality, a participatory style of leadership and development in the instutution. For the most part this is probably a rational conclusion but like any assumption it would have to be verified in practice.

Generally speaking senior management set the goals for both courses and evaluation. Tensions can easily arise between what are then seen to be 'official' and 'unofficial' goals or expectations. Qualities such as critical thinking in corporate management may be an admirable end, but cannot be achieved without criticising something or somebody, and this can cause problems. Dangers arise from either seeing evaluation as a process of supplying support for the official goals of an institution, or for seeing it as encouraging change. On the one hand the result is conservatism (or stability or stagnation, depending on one's viewpoint), or on the other 'bandwagon' developments. The balance between stability and change is often difficult to judge, and of course it is a crude distinction, since one person's view of stability might be another's view of development. The process of evaluation may encourage either, and it probably encourages an awareness of one or the other.

Much could be said about the management of course evaluations, especially in terms of who commissions it, for what purposes, and how does it fit into a participatory or corporate view of course development. The setting up of formal structures has an effect on evaluation which, as previously indicated, need not necessarily lead to openness or mutual accountability. Also forms of external evaluation or assessment, which may include the views of external examiners, need not lead to a greater degree of judgemental detachment in making decisions, and to that extent although it may make for convenience in

aspects of management. This administrative convenience may be at the expense of interstitutional commitment.

Management and Assessment Data

An important concern in any aspect of assessment is the ownership and control of data. There can be occasions when some information may not be made generally available, and the question of who controls the availability of the information arises. Management structures may seek to make information widely available, or they may try to make it selectively available. Whatever the wish it will concern the evaluation of the institution and it should be aware of its own intentions, and have a management structure which reflects or facilitates the accomplishment of these. The current concern in many institutions of higher education, mirrored more widely in society, of decision-making involving students and teachers is perhaps part of the move from a mechanistic or bureaucratic view of education in which the curriculum is set on pre-ordinate objectives, managed by set committees, and in which evaluation is stylised for validation purposes. The recognition of the need to use informal and hidden procedures in assessment and decision making cause serious difficulties in institutional evaluation, and failure to take them into account will lead at best to an incomplete picture, and certainly a distorted one.

One of the important roles of management is in communicating information so that relevant decisions are made by relevant people with the necessary relevant information. The management function is more than the circulating of information, and yet to go beyond this into its selection and weighting can be dangerous. Information management is a complex matter which when formalised in committee structures can elicit formalised reactions and can cause predictable stability or development in an institution. It becomes possible through this to selectively ignore unwanted information, and to selectively highlight supportive information.

In evaluating an educational institution it is inevitable that comparisons be introduced, and yet evaluations cannot be generalised; they are strictly context-based, and as such are of value to an institution with its own needs. Of course the principles on which evaluation takes place can be widely applied and it is on this assumption that is based the development which will have a profound effect on many institutions in higher education when the Council for National Academic Awards introduces its proposals for 'Partnership in Validation'. The implications of this kind of development on institutional evaluation are considerable, and space would not permit elaboration of these: but it should be pointed out that a significant move might be to make all staff and students more accountable in an institutional evaluation, rather than, as at present, to see senior management as being those largely responsible.

EVALUATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS: PROBLEMS AND PURPOSES

J.M. Shepherd

Senior Assistant Education Officer (Schools)
Barnsley L.E.A.

There are a lot of people actively evaluating schools, for a lot of different reasons, in a lot of different ways. Parents evaluate schools in order to make choices of school for their children, and perhaps more importantly against their children's continuing needs as pupils. Employers evaluate schools for the purpose of sele-ting employees. Sometimes this only means that schools have a 'reputation'; the fact that very often it is undeserved makes it no less difficult to change, and no less important to that school.

The kind of evaluation we are most used to is that undertaken by HMI and LEA advisers. Advisers do not as often produce formal reports of the kind that result from HMI inspections; they tend, however, to evaluate in the same kind of way, primarily through observation in and out of the classroom, examination of syllabi and pupils' work, and through discussion with teachers.

These professional evaluators may also make use of 'objective' evidence about schools. Most Authorities attempt an analysis of examination results and record attendance; they may also have the results of standardised tests taken by pupils. The ILEA pamphlet Keeping the School Under Review (ILEA, 1977) suggests twelve measures the secondary school might take of itself. Rutter et al. (1979) used five measures of success in studying twelve London schools: attendance, examination results, and measures of behaviour, employment success and delinquency.

All schools are continously evaluating their own work. Only a small (but increasing) number do it systematically. Some aspects of this evaluatory work are occasionally opened up to consultants (e.g. advisers) or are reported (e.g. to governors). A number of LEAs* have published pamphlets designed specifically or partly to assist schools in self-evaluation. Others have used other methods, for example in-service courses, to encourage schools to tackle this task more systematically.

It would be possible to consider these kinds of evaluation against Stake's (1976) eight dimensions of evaluation procedures, or House's (1977) taxonomy of major evaluation models; and it would be easy to identify some of the obvious ways in which they differ. This paper proposes, however, that it is more important to concentrate upon the reasons for evaluation. These may be:

(1) better to support and advise schools;

(2) to learn about schools or schooling as a basis for
    (a) generalisation (i.e. research); and
    (b) change (self-evaluation in particular).

(3) for choice of school by parents, and the continued monitoring of the work of schools;

(4) to facilitate accountability.

Despite these different aims all evaluation must consist of asking questions and seeking information on which to make a judgement. Taking three questions from LEA documents mentioned earlier, it is possible to see how such questions could be asked by different people for each of the ends postulated. Such questions as these might be selected:

> "Are departments sufficiently aware of the educational standards demanded for employment?" (ILEA, 1977)

---

* For example, the Inner London Education Authority, Surrey, Salford, Leeds, Solihull, Oxfordshire and Dorset.

"What means are used to assess the academic progress of each pupil?" (Leeds, 1979)

"Do the teachers modify their teaching in the light of childrens' responses?" (Salford, 1979)

However, two other things should also be apparent. First, that answering such questions in a satisfactory way is exceedingly difficult. The view that evaluation of schools is easy is amazingly widespread. At the level of overall effectiveness, most people, including many teachers, subscribe to the view that 'everyone knows' which in their areas are the 'good' schools and which the 'bad'. Yet it is unlikely that there is valid and reliable information available, certainly not publicly, on the basis of which comparisons could be attempted, nor that more than a handful of people would know the school well enough in relation to others to make a considered assessment. The second is that, although it could be argued that the evaluatory activities mentioned earlier amount to a "fairly formidable and continuous testing out of the reputation of any and every school" (Becher and Maclure, 1978), it is clear that not all purposes are met equally well. In particular the gap between the first two (the 'professional') purposes and the last two (the 'public') purposes is enormous. he present dilemma can be expressed as follows: evaluating complex and rapidly changing organisations such as schools is so difficult that it is not done well even by the 'professionals'; 'public' judgement is even more difficult and will inevitably remain so if all serious information about schools is 'private'; yet the record of simplistic, prejudiced and ill-formed public comment on schools cannot inspire confidence in those who control information and its communication. Any proposal for change must be aimed at easing this dilemma; those made thus far also serve to illustrate it.

One proposal for making evaluatory information more widely available is the publication of examination results. Most Authorities already undertake an analysis: they tend however to keep comparative information confidential, not without reason. Firstly, there is a major problem of interpretation. It inevitably is out-of-date information at the moment of publication. The figures will conceal very different patterns

of entry and 'success' between different examinations, between different subjects, between years; there is almost certainly no way of assessing them against the measured ability of its 11+ entry. Secondly, there is the problem of whether examination results can be a proper measure of a school's success. Clearly they measure only one kind of output (not all pupils take part), and output in itself is a limited concept in relation to schooling. It is also implicit in the thinking of for example HMI and local authority advisers, that the 'best' schools or the 'best' departments, do not necessarily produce the 'best' examination results. The most extreme examples of this are schools which deliberately set out to exploit the examination system through the clever use of examination boards, the timing of entries, the use of dual entry, a very high level of entry and a teaching programme geared solely to such a system. This suggests a third problem. Such schools undoubtedly in the eyes of many parents would be very successful whatever the professionals might feel; the way such information could be used by individual parents as a basis for choice and as a means of putting pressure on a school may not be in the interests of all children in a school, or of all schools in an area.

A proposal for a better public means of evaluating schools for the purposes of accountability has been made by Becher and Maclure (1978). This is for a resular CNAA-style visitation for schools by an independent group; in two days they believe "that any experienced professional could in the majority of cases reach an independent agreement with his peers about whether or not a school was doing a good job". "Nor need it", they say, "take too much time and effort for him to identify where any major failings might like and to what they could be attributed" (p.228). Apart from the 'political' difficulties of such an arrangement, I feel that they underestimate the difficulties of deciding which are 'good'. I have worked with the same small group of secondary schools over a period of more than five years, yet there are

few judgements about the relative effectiveness of the schools that I would wish to make. This is despite having access to information from HMI and advisers' reports, from detailed analysis of examination results over a period of time, of curriculum review and analyses of resource use and organisation, as well as continuous personal contact and opportunity for observation. Becher and Maclure also underestimate the difficulties of establishing the causes of 'any major failings', and more importantly of what you do about it. The CNAA visitation might find that a school was only too well aware of its failings, was working away at them against intractable practical difficulties, and would resent the superficial comments of any group of outsiders, even more so if they were made public. In what is a very interesting book on accountability, it is the untypical William Tyndale which is the only specific school situation which gets a mention.

The adoption of self-evaluation by schools is also currently being promoted. A number of schools, as already mentioned, are putting considerable effort into it. LEAs are helping in three ways: the publication of guide-lines for internal evaluation, the mounting of in-service courses on self-evaluation, and the circulation of comparative information on examination results, test results, analyses of resource use and curriculum summaries. This is in addition to traditional methods of providing feedback through informal and formal reporting. The practical limits of self-evaluation remain however:

(1) it is difficult and time consuming;

(2) it is difficult to introduce to busy and sceptical teachers and to ensure their willing and honest co-operation;

(3) it may not lead to action. Standards are not changed simply by checking them more often.

However, of the three proposed developments, this latter offers most promise. The development of self-evaluation

may lead to better reporting to parents, for example; or for purposes of accountability. This is in line with the view expressed by Harlen (1978),

> If we start from considering the kind of evaluation which is useful in the classroom, where the focus of educational decision should be, we may well find that the techniques and the information they supply are equally applicable to evaluations carried out for purposes outside the school, whereas the reverse is less likely to be true.

Even so there are limits to how far and how fast it is realistic to expect this process to proceed. A real prospect might be to develop a more meaningful exchange with parents on the specific features of a school in relation to the needs of a child. However the present limits of accountability are demonstrated in the practice of governing bodies. By and large, they do not engage in evaluation or render schools accountable. The September minutes of the Governing Body of most secondary schools records their congratulations on the examination results and probably the annual attendance figures. Accountability means more than giving account of oneself; it must mean that those to whom one is accountable are in a position to direct or sanction. With the best will in the world it may not be possible to find the ways or the time regularly to present information on major aspects of the work of the school, in a way which would constitute an adequate basis for the kind of sensitive judgements which need to be made. Heads may feel that they cannot be sure that sensitivity will be present. LEAs are aware that the use of advisers for procedures aimed at accountability might jeapodize the traditional advisory role; and they may be all too familiar with the misuse of statistical data. Teachers may rightly suspect that accountability could be crude and damaging. The compromise must be to find ways in which schools and the 'professionals' in them can better explain themselves and what they do: and if this exposes them to 'influence' of the consumer and the public this may be better than exposing them to their control. On the other hand it seems that in the

worst situations, the traditional autonomy of the school and the teacher has (probably as a consequence of a loss of professional security in the face of public criticism, and personal insecurity in the face of an increasingly difficult and complex job), degenerated into what a colleague calls 'touch-me-not-ism', in which there is an established hostile posture to any possibility of criticism, any suggestion of being asked to give account. In this situation even the notion of self-evaluation is threatening; it is after all asking a lot of most people to require them to be objective about their own work. Schools require the support and encouragement of LEAs to sustain a belief that their interests lie in the fastest possible improvement in the level of both private and public debate about their work.

One way to reduce the threat to schools as well as to advance the cause of accountability, might be to consider whether the LEA should be 'a', if not 'the', 'primary unit of accountability' with an obligation to report on the quality of education across its area. The burden of reporting to parents would be that of the school, the burden of reporting to the community could in part be passed to the Authority.

References

Becher, T. and S. Maclure (1978), Accountability in Education. NFER.

Harlen, W. (ed) (1978), Evaluation and the Teacher's Role. Macmillan Education.

House, E.R. (1977), Assumptions Underlying Evaluation Models. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977.

ILEA (1977), Keeping the School Under Review. Inner London Education Authority.

Leeds Education Department (1979), Looking at the Curriculum in Schools. Leeds Metropolitan District Council, Education Department.

Rutter, M., et al. (1979), Fifteen Thousand Hours. Open Books.

Salford Education Department (1979), Primary School Profile. Salford M.D.C., Education Department.

Stoke, R.E. (1976), Evaluating Educational Programmes: the Need and the Response. Paris: OECD/CERI.

KNOWING SCHOOLS: A CASE IN POINT

David Smetherham

Research Officer
The Schools Council
London

The extent to which schools, and the teachers in them, can act as independent agents of curriculum change is an important factor in curriculum innovation. However, the extent to which they are themselves constrained (whether knowingly or not) in the exercise of this choice is rarely viewed as an empirical question. To what extent are schools aware of the various possibilities for change? What is the role and responsibility of the administrator in promoting change?

The difficulty is that the control of a school's curriculum is frequently implicit, and the power structures that underwrite it only rarely exposed. Moreover, any such exposure will tend to occur in a context of controversy and rhetoric - perhaps not the most appropriate time for examining the principles assumed to be involved. It is particularly unfortunate that, as yet, the educational world possesses only a minimal understanding of how schools, and those involved with them, cope when some desired change fails to come about. Such occasions are often painful and the last thing such schools desire, understandably, is the hovering presence of an outside researcher or evaluator writing it all down. On the other hand, by unduly concentrating on successful innovations, an important aspect of the story is omitted. The more so when the 'for instance' becomes an event whose repercussions subsequently rather tend to change the possibilities.

Research in general, and particularly the evaluation of educational institutions, can thus often pose questions concerning the control of school curricula. The documentation surrounding William Tyndale is probably the most comprehensive ever collected on the functioning of a single educational institution at a given moment of time. For this reason, William Tyndale is used in the paper as a case study illustrating something of the tense relationship between the evaluations of educational administrators, and those working in the institution being evaluated.

To understand the surveillance procedures within which William Tyndale was situated it is necessary to be aware of the relevant background. The Inner London Education Authority Inspectorate operates two overlapping systems of intelligence about what is happening in the primary schools within its jurisdiction.

The primary school team of inspectors, consisting of eight full-time and two part-time inspectors, is responsible for about 900 primary and nursery schools. In addition London has a system of District Inspectors who are primarily responsible for advising and supporting the teaching staffs of all schools within their district, in this case 69 schools. Both Dean (1978) and the ILEA see a major function of the inspectorate/advisory service as being the giving of advice and support to the teachers in the schools. One of the tensions that I hope to bring out in this paper is the difference between this and the increasing demands that schools be accountable as institutions, or that education be monitored as a system.

A new Inspector such as Mr Rice* would presumably have

---

*Although correct names are available in the Auld(1976) Report, I have used alt-ernative names for those involved with the William Tyndale schools.

had access to a file enabling him to build up a situation report of William Tyndale before arranging a visit. It would provide the perspective, constitute a labelling device, through which all the early actions would be viewed.

In a very real sense then, for the beginning inspector - as for any administrator - if the information is not on file, it does not exist. From what one can assume the file would contain documents such as the applications and references of staff appointed to the school; informal and formal records of meetings and correspondence with staff and other education officers with an interest; documents relating to the meetings of the managing body.

Mr Davis, the new Head of William Tyndale, had previously introduced and co-ordinated a team of five teachers at his previous school. His old head "spoke very highly" (Auld, 9176, paragraph 164) of Mr Davis' abilities in introducing and running this team. Mr Davis had been appointed as Deputy Headteacher of this school for 3 years and acted as Headteacher for a further year. The open report prepared in respect of Mr Davis' application for the present post by the Inspectorate is given in para. 166:

> Mr Davis is a likeable enthusiastic teacher, always ready to experiment. He maintains constant interest among his pupils in a fluid working atmosphere. He came to the school as a fairly young deputy and quickly made his mark. A sincere and forthright character, he has formed excellent relationships with the staff....

Mr Clarke's notes on the Davis' interview by the Managers in November 1973 were doubtless also on file. Auld notes that:

> It appears from Mr Clarke's notes of the interview that Mr Davis made a good impression and appeared to be a quiet, interesting and balanced individual with some flashes of humour and 'perceptive' 'on social and education aspects.... (para. 168)

Mr Clarke's evidence to Auld was that his visits to the school itself were 'sparse' and that such knowledge as

he had "came entirely from the information given to him by Mrs Sheehan" (Deputy Head and acting Head for the autumn term 1973). The 'information for headteachers' report written by Mr Clarke for the May round of interviews (for which no appointment was made) and repeated in November 1973, stated:

> ... The headmaster who left at the end of the Summer Term ... was a man of exceptional ability and established a style of approach that is extremely forward looking, organized and cohesive. He exercised a firm and positive but democratic leadership. In all areas of the curriculum a child-centred approach has been developed and there is much of interest in the work produced.
>
> The new head will need to have wide human and social sympathies to cope with the unusual range of children and parents and should be well experienced in this type of area. It is a thriving establishment to take over, the staff will respond well, but there is a high standard to maintain. (Para.104).

It means that any newcomer - inspector or administrator - reading this file as a source of much of his initial knowledge about a school would not foresee any particular difficulties apart from the difficulties facing any new head. This despite that on the ground Auld retrospectively details the fact that the school was in considerable difficulties.

Mr Gray, the divisional inspector and member of the primary school inspection team, took up his appointment on 1 March 1974. His first routine visit took place on 1 April. The perspective from which this visit was viewed was the previously indicated 'file knowledge'. And on file the school could pass muster.

What then took place on this first visit? As Auld (1976, para. 220 and 221) notes:

> ... According to the evidence of Mr Gray to the Inquiry, he had a general discussion with Mr Davis about the school and about Mr Davis' policies as a new Headteacher, Mr Davis mentioned

> that he was having some problems and indicated that half of his staff of eight teachers was progressive in outlook and that the other half was more traditional in approach. Mr Davis went on to say that he wanted to free the timetable from class-based lessons and to institute vertical grouping of children. Mr Davis put forward various ideas to Mr Gray which were basically acceptable on educational grounds, but Mr Gray felt and advised Mr Davis that, as a new Headteacher, he should proceed slowly with changes and make sure to keep both managers and parents fully informed of what he was doing.
>
> It was Mr Gray's impression that Mr Davis needed "every possible support" in his attempts to introduce new teaching methods, and he resolved to visit the school again as soon as possible at the beginning of the following term.

The difficulty at this point is that of how best to manage change. The concept is essentially sound but the strategy problematic. Mr Davis is a new headteacher, Mr Gray a 'new' inspector. The role of the inspector is perceived to be that of a supporter and critical friend and it is in this capacity that Mr Gray resolves to visit the school again at the beginning of the following term.

Mr Gray visited the associated Infants School on 20 May 1974, when:

> Miss Hall felt obliged to complain to him about noise from the Junior School and the interruption of lessons in the Infants School as a result of juniors wandering around unattended and into her part of the school during normal school hours.... Mr Gray visited the Junior School three days later and talked to Mr Davis about these complaints. Mr Davis expressed the view that children should be free and not subject to constant supervision, but did say that he was taking steps to ensure that the children would be more controlled in the future. However, he made the point that he had some disruptive children in the school who were difficult to cater for....
>
> ...On this second visit to the Junior School Mr Gray took the opportunity to discuss generally with Mr Davis the organisation of the school and the need for him to keep a check on basic standards of work and behaviour (Auld, para.307).

At about the same time one of the teachers at William Tyndale, a Mrs Butler, had a number of criticisms of the direction being taken under Mr Davis' leadership and sought a meeting with Mr Gray. Bearing in mind the bureaucratic view of the school, and that Mrs Butler is described in the report as, at the very least, 'dogmatic', it is not surprising that Mr Rice does not appear to have appreciated the rapid deterioration that was taking place at William Tyndale Junior School. Nonetheless, there is some cause for concern and Mr Rice makes two evaluative visits to the Junior School in early June.

> ... in order, as he said in evidence to the Inquiry, to have a look at general discipline and to observe the teaching of the probationary teacher, Miss Johnson (whose teaching he found satisfactory), he does not appear to have noticed anything to cause him particular concern. (Auld, para.308).

In practice of course things were far from alright and many of the underlying tensions begin to emerge at this point.

The role of the local inspector/advisor is severely constrained by the limited time available for the performance of the task at hand. Local advisers (together with their HMI colleagues, administrators, even Schools Council personnel) must manage time effectively. Visits to schools must be squeezed for information - and squeezed hard. It is at this point that the adviser is most clearly acting in an evaluative capacity. They need to assess what they see before they can advise anyone at any level. Because they are rarely thick enough on the ground to get to know what is happening in a given situation as well as the teacher in the classroom, the advisers need to develop a high level of professional skill if they are to be of use to teachers and to the local authority which they serve.

Skills of observation, in questioning and interviewing others to gain information are an important aspect of

the advier's role (Dean, 1978). Obviously this is a skill already possessed in some degree by anyone appointed to an advisory position: nonetheless it can probably be developed. The difficulty is that I suspect it is more frequently developed on the apprenticeship system. The assumption is that advisers will pick it up as they go along. As far as I am aware there are relatively few organised opportunities for these skills to be developed within a professional framework.

At the same time a literature does exist, and these skills are possessed by a number of evaluators/researchers (and indeed experienced advisers). Perhaps it is time for such people to be drawn together for the purpose of sharing their knowledge and practice and perhaps developing a course for advisers that would address this problem. The skills could be tried out in non-threatening ways, discussed with one's colleagues on the course, and the appropriate skills developed and confidence gained in their deployment.

A separate, although very much related issue might be the development of some structured observation or interview schedule(s) for use on school visits. Although this is a rather grand description, and although the task of developing such a schedule might involve considerable thought, the end product could turn out to be something that is both effective and fairly straightforward to use.

One of the weaknesses demonstrated by William Tyndale is the inherent difficulty of assessing the performance of teachers or schools when there is no agreement on what they are supposed to be doing. In the absence of any agreed criteria all that is possible

> ... is for professional experts to go into a school, look at what the teachers were doing, talk to the teachers themselves about it, and then make their own assessment.... But there was no basis on which one school could be compared with another - except the subjective impressions of the inspectors, a group of men or women whose sole qualification for the job

> was that they had once been good teachers. (Gretton and Jackson, 1976, p.123).

Perhaps another urgent task for education is to establish some sort of framework(s) for the curriculum against which schools could be profiled. A pair, or perhaps a number of pairs, of spectacles for viewing the school curriculum and indicating its strengths and weaknesses. It may be of interest that the Schools Council is about to engage in debate concerning both the desirability and feasibility of just such an exercise.

In trying to build up a picture of the school as a whole it is likely that different accounts will be provided by the different groups involved. As Dean (1978) points out:

> We each tend to make judgements according to our particular frames of reference. Thus problems arise because we do not sufficiently take into account differences between the frames of reference of teacher and pupil, teacher and parent, teacher and adviser, adviser and administrator, administrator and councillor and employer and so on.... It is certainly necessary in any evaluation to discover the frames of reference of those who are involved and arrive at some common view of what is being assessed and how the assessments are to be judged. Advisers need to be particularly sensitive to the frames of reference of the schools and teachers whose work they assess, if they are to be able to help and support them.

On this view it is likely that the views of, for example, senior staff will differ from those of junior staff. Pupils will likely be different again. The difficulty, exemplified by William Tyndale, is that protocol frequently means that the head teacher becomes the major channel of information about the school Of course, this is right and proper, but it does create certain difficulties for the adviser.

It will be remembered that, on his first visit, the Head of William Tyndale had informed the district inspector that "he was having some problems and indicated that half of his staff of eight teachers were progressive in outlook and that the other half were more traditional in outlook."

Again this is an area where evaluation practice may be of help to the adviser. For example, the first step in this direction could be the development of an appropriate sampling frame for use on school visits. Over a period of time advisers will need to ensure that approaches are made to representatives of the different groups involved in the schooling process. This would involve the appropriation of a wide variety of techniques drawn from the practice of evaluation eresearch. Dean (1978) draws attention to one dimension of this in her suggestion that much can be learned by spending a day in a secondary school following the timetable of a particular group pf pupils.

Similarly, certain advisers are beginning to use the notion of group interviews to obtain some 'purchase' on the different frames of reference that are to be found in any particular school. During a visit, and over a period of time, arrangements might be put in hand to talk to representative groups: heads of departments, experienced teachers newly appointed to the school, beginning teachers, sixth form pupils, first year pupils, and pupils over the range of ability. Of course, the introduction of this notion could be seen as threatening to a school, and it will involve certain political, interpersonal and technical skills on the part of the adviser. The point is that some advisers are beginning to use such an approach and it may now be useful to consider how these skills can be encouraged and developed. It is possible that William Tyndale need never have happened in the way it did had it been possible for the inspector to use this technique with the progressive and traditional groups into which the staff of the school were beginning to polarise.

A final comment on William Tyndale's concerns a dimension that is missing from the Auld Report: those tensions arising from the interpersonal problems that are created by the structure within which theadvisory service operates. I

would suggest two aspects are important for Tyndale. The first concerns the effective burden placed, at least initially, on the unaided assessment of the district inspector. This was sharpened up by the official (file) intelligence on the school: "a thriving establishment". This paper has already suggested that perhaps there ought to be some mechanism of dual reporting on schools. Although two people in agreement are not necessarily more correct in their judgement it does begin to remove some of the pressures placed on the evaluative judgements of one person acting alone.

In the case of William Tyndale, the inspector was akin to the member of school staff who publicly complains about the behaviour of a pupil with whom no one else has experienced any difficulty. If (s)he persists, that teacher can quickly be labelled as somehow incompetent by colleagues. On the other hand it <u>is</u> quite acceptable to complain about pupils that also create difficulties for other members of staff. Indeed such complaints will quite likely receive a sympathetic hearing. The parallel is that in the files of the Authority, William Tyndale was a thriving establishment; the previous district inspector had been promoted to a line management position exercising certain authority over his replacement; the new inspector was also new to the Authority - indeed only six weeks into the appointment. Nonetheless, even on his first visit this "thriving establishment" seems to be in potential trouble. Given these structural tensions I am not surprised that the new inspector felt under some pressure to deal with the situation himself rather than immediately consulting with colleagues. In the event things were on the boil and time ran out very quickly, leaving him quite exposed.

To some extent this tension was heightened by another dimension. Given that the adviser offers an important supportive role, much of his authority will derive from the development of a trusting and professional relationship with the staff. At the same time children's education

is suffering and in cases where the teacher at school is seriously failing, action cannot be too long delayed. The adviser is also an agent of the employer. Any report of difficulty immediately changes the nature of the relationship and, as with William Tyndale, can be triggered off by some other action. Importantly, it also redefines the meaning of past encounters in that what has previously been a private confidence now becomes a rather public record. Thus, although the adviser can only to the job properly by building up trusting relationships a latent understanding is that, certainly from the headteacher's perspective, this trust can be abused at any moment. What is told in confidence cannot always remain there.

References

Auld, R. (1976), William Tyndale Junior and Infant Schools: Public Inquiry. Inner London Education Authority. (The Auld Report).

Dean, J. (1978), "Evaluation and the advisory service," Journal of the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers, No.8, Spring.

Gretton, J. and M. Jackson (1976), William Tyndale: Collapse of a School or a System? Allen and Unwin.

THE EVALUATION OF 'WORK AREA' PRIORITIES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

D.M. Smith

School of Education
University of Nottingham

This paper attempts to make an initial examination of some of the basic issues that have to be faced should the evaluation of the 'work area' priorities of secondary schools be attempted. Many of these areas are 'subjects' within the curriculum, and the study, in this respect, will be concerned with curricular priorities. It would, however, be unnecessarily limiting to confine the study of 'work areas' to curricular matters. Substantial resources may be allocated to other fields of activity, particularly pastoral and administrative ones, perhaps even at the expense of curricular areas. For this reason the term 'work area' is preferred to one that is limited solely to curricular matters. Having said this, however, it would still seem probable that curricular activities would be the ones to which most attention must be given, and these form the main concern of this paper.

The Need to Evaluate 'Work Area' Priorities

Despite recent disclaimers (DES, 1977, p.6) the ranking of curricular areas has been a continuous and important practice illustrated historically by such features as general government directives (Board of Education, 1902), the requirements of external examination bodies (Banks, 1963), and the reports of government appointed committees; and contemporaneously through such empirical exercises as studies of time-table allocations (Weston, 1977) and external examination entries (DES, 1976). This ranking has applied to broad knowledge areas and to more

specialist subjects (Jenkins, 1979). There is no space here to do other than indicate these points. Neither is it possible to discuss the present need to evaluate carefully these 'work area' priorities, except to draw attention to the contradictory assertions made by interested parties as to the relative positions of their particular knowledge areas (Smith, 1978). This brief section might suitably conclude, however, with the suggestion that the increasing complexity of schools combined with growing demands for accountability in education (Becher and Maclure, 1978), generally would appear to make such information valuable at national, regional, local authority and school levels.

Measures of 'Work Area' Priorities

A rational resolution of problems in a democratic society can only be approached through the collection and general distribution of information whose meaning can command a wide level of agreement. That is to say, far from accepting the relativist position (Bernbaum, 1977), that any opinion is as valid as any other, or the pure theoretician's one (Thompson, 1978), that phenomena can be understood only through the elaboration of set assumptions, this paper suggests that one of the most urgent requirements in the present educational system is the careful development of indices that will be generally accepted, through the process of argument and empirical demonstration, as providing accurate, reliable and reasonbly valid measures of the information sought. It terms of this paper, the information being sought is that which would contribute towards the evaluation of 'work area' priorities in secondary schools.

An examination of contemporary and historical sources would show the wide variety of measures that have been used, and that the measures concentrate, almost entirely, on curricular matters. In the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries it was thought that central curricular regulations backed up by the opinions of such experts as

national inspectors would provide the best description of school practices. Indeed, important decisions, for example, the introduction of the 1904 Secondary Regulations, were made on the basis of the acceptability of this information. Yet there is evidence that the congruence between central regulations and expert opinions on the one hand and school practices on the other was not particularly close (Smith, 1980).

Other, more quantitative, measures have also been used to assess curricular priorities. The earliest of these was 'timetable allocation' which, from its introduction into secondary education surveys by the Clarendon and Taunton Commissions in the 1860's, has become the most popular measure of subject rankings. A recent example of its use is that by Weston (1977) who adopted Davies' (1969) classification scheme. A second measure which was introduced in the nineteenth century and has been widely used ever since makes use of external examination entries. The use of this information in the Department of Education and Science Statistics of Education and the Inspectorate's subject reports indicates how popular a measure this still remains. Other indices that have been used include measures of teachers' tuition time (DES, 1968) numbers of pupils taking subjects (DES, 1975) and various forms of financial resources (Cummings, 1971). These financial resources have, on different occasions, taken the form of building resources, capitation and other equipment allowances, and teachers' salary resources. These indicators may all be termed iterative measures, which is to say that they are measures of descrete individual variables from which, it is hoped, the influence of other variables can be excluded.

Other investigators, however, believe that measures which consist of single variables are less powerful than measures consisting of a combination of variables which, when summed, would provide a more comprehensive indicator. The

advantages of summative studies would seem to be strong in educational systems which allocate a number of different resources to 'work areas'. In situations such as this it might seem sensible that a measure should be a composite one which would include, for example, a number of different elements of resource allocation. It might be thought to be particularly appropriate when comparisons are made between different educational systems or between different periods within the same system where the likelihood of a variety of resources being used is strong. An example of such summarive indices is Blaug and Woodhall's (1968) attempt to combine indices such as teachers' salaries, pupils' times, building costs and goods and services costs, to form a single measure. Bunton (Ross et al, 1972) attempts to combine teachers' salary points and class numbers to form a measure with which to compare the allocation of resources to pupils grouped in terms of ability and sex. Other, more popular examples are used in unit cost analyses and include such measures as pupil/teacher ratios (Byrne et alm 1975), expenditure per pupil (Pratt et al, 1973) and teachers' salaries per pupil (Davies, 1968).

There are, however, serious difficulties associated with the use of this summative approach. It is difficult to decide, on any but the most subjective grounds, how the various elements should be weighted. Moreover, there is also the danger that summation is likely to obscure fundamental differences between items. Indeed, Vaisey (1972, p.215) would go so far as to state that "non-additive iterative procedures rather than summation must be used". Yet if this advice is followed there is a danger of even greater distortion than that caused by the summation of diverse items because important sources of information might have been ignored. At this early stage in the study of 'work area' priorities it is probably advisable not to be too prescriptive but to experiment

with a variety of approaches. Nevertheless, on the grounds that it is often advisable to proceed from the simpler to the more complex, rather more attention might be given to non-additive, iterative types of measure. It is for this reason that the measures that have been used in the final section of this paper are of this kind.

Criteria by Which to Assess a Measure's Acceptability

A measure's acceptability must be assessed in terms of the extent to which it satisfies three main criteria - accuracy, reliability and validity. Accuracy in this context would seem to involve not only questions about the care taken during the collection of data, but also whether the measures adequately cover the range of 'work area' activities that occur in schools. The inaccuracies of 'external examination' measures which arise from their inability to cover both non-examinable outcomes and the activities of non-examination pupils, would need to be compared with the inaccuracies of 'timetable' measures which are unable to cover extra-curricular activities and find it difficult to cope with the complexities of fourth and fifth year options and the fragmented curricula of sixth form pupils. The inadequacies of both these measures would need to be compared with the problems associated with the use of 'financial resource' indicators. Here the inaccuracies are not so much due to inadequate coverage but arise from a danger that extraneous variables may exist whose presence might weaken the relationship between 'work area' priorities and the distribution of financial resources. For example, the effects of such factors as teachers' ages, sex and personal attributes on the distribution of salary resources would have to be carefully examined before a convincing case could be made for using the distribution of salary resources as an accurate measure of 'work area' priorities.

Problems associated with the criterion of reliability would seem to be more easily resolved when dealing with the measurement of practices at institutional levels

compared, for example, with attempts to measure attitudes and other individual attributes. In the latter studies problems of consistency frequently arise and great care must be taken to avoid the measure being influenced by the timing of the measurement, the test situation and the tester himself. In the kinds of studies described here, however, most of the data, from which measures are likely to be constructed, already exist and the main task is to collect the information and assess it in terms of accuracy and validity. There are, for example, a number of elements present in educational organisations, particularly inputs such as financial resources, time resources, manpower resources which can be readily transformed into major forms of 'work area' provision. Moreover, such elements form such a major investment in 'work areas' that their distribution is unlikely to vary randomly over time. Unreliable measures do, of course, exist. Capitation resources can be affected by a variety of factors whose influence is exerted for only a short period of time. For example, individual 'work areas' will require, on occasions, an exceptional share of the capitation funds in order to refurbish stocks. For this reason and also because capitation resources make up only a small part (less than 3% for 'books and stationery' and about 10% for 'furniture and other equipment') of total current expenditure (Vaizey, 1968) it is unlikely that this item would form a reliable indicator of 'work area' priorities. Such items should, however, be fairly easy to recognise.

The third criterion which measures would have to satisfy is that of validity - that what is being measured is a true indicator of 'work area' emphases. It might be found, for example, that variations in pupil/teacher ratios between 'work areas' are influenced by such factors as safety requirements or client pressures and that consequently, low teacher/pupil ratios might not indicate 'work areas' of high prestige. Similarly, the distribution of time between 'work areas' may bear little relationship with school priorities if the pupils taking part in such

activities have, themselves, already been ranked in terms of prestige. It is not impossible that some schools may 'fill-out' the timetables of groups of low prestige pupils with activities in such a way that bears little relationship to general school priorities.

These examples may seem to suggest that the difficulties of demonstrating the validity of measures are so great that they are sufficient grounds for giving up any attempt to evaluate 'work area' priorities. This, however, would seem to be an extreme position to adopt. It it is assumed, as this paper assumes, that it is possible to approach an objective understanding of organisational activities through careful empirical enquiry and reasoned argument, and that the end product, in the form of useful information, is work acquiring, then these must be seen as problems that have to be faced and resolved and not as reasons for denying the possibility of valid evaluation studies. Moreover, although the criteria of accuracy, reliability and validity must be satisfied as fully as possible, this does not mean that such extreme standards are to be set that no measure can ever be acceptable. The demands for extreme scientific probity must be weighed against the needs of groups involved with education management to have access to information.

References

Banks, O. (1963), Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Becher, T. and S. Maclure (1978), Accountability in Education. N.F.E.R.

Bernbaum, G. (1977), Knowledge and Ideology in the Sociology of Education. Macmillan.

Blaug, M. and M. Woodhall (1968), "Productivity trends in British secondary education, 1950-1963," Sociology of Education, vol. 41, no.1.

Board of Education (1902), Regulations for Secondary Day Schools 1902-3. HMSO.

Board of Education (1934-38), Reports. HMSO.

Byrne, D. et al (1975), The Poverty of Education. Martin Robertson.

Consultative Committee on Secondary Education (1938), Report. HMSO.

Cummings, C.E. (1971), Studies in Educational Costs. Scottish Academic Press.

Davies, B. (1968), Social Needs and Resources in Local Services. Michael Joseph.

Davies, T.I. (1969), School Organisation. Pergamon.

DES (1968), Survey of the Curriculum and Deployment of Teachers (Secondary Schools), 1965-66. Part I - Teachers. HMSO.

DES (1975), Curricular Differences for Boys and Girls. Education Survey, 21. HMSO.

DES (1976), Statistics in Education. HMSO. See figures for entries to 'science' and 'English studies' in Ordinary Level GCE and CSE examinations.

DES (1977), Curriculum 11-16: Working Papers by HM Inspectorate. HMSO.

Jenkins, E.W. (1979), From Armstrong to Nuffield: Studies in Twentieth Century Science Education in England and Wales. John Murray.

Pratt, J. et al (1973), Your Local Education. Penguin.

Ross, J.M., W.J. Bunton et al. (1972), A Critical Appraisal of Comprehensive Education. NFER.

Smith, D.M. (1978), "Studies of curricular imbalances in secondary schools," Educational Studies, vol.4, no.3.

Smith, D.M. (1980), "The evaluation of curricular practices in secondary schools: Regulations, opinions and school practices in England, 1903-1904." Forthcoming.

Thompson, E.P. (1978), The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays. Merlin Press.

Vaizey, J. (1968), Resources for Education. Allen and Unwin.

Vaizey, J. et al. (1972), The Political Economy of Education. Duckworth.

Weston, P.B. (1977), Framework for the Curriculum. NFER.

'OBJECTIVE' MEASUREMENTS IN THE EVALUATION OF SCHOOLS BY LEAs

M.A. Sterne

Assistant Education Officer (Schools)
Manchester LEA

Few, if any, education departments undertake any systematic evaluation of their schools. The simple publication of the results of external examinations is more an expression of an attempt to import the idea of a market economy into the education system than a serious exercise. It is difficult to regard the general inspection as a serious contribution to systematic evaluation. It can only take place at long intervals; it occupies a brief period in the life of the school; but above all it is artificial. The presence in the institution of the inspectors must affect what they see. The phrase 'good school' is common currency, but is seldom defined. H.M. Inspectors (DES, 1977) certainly attempt no definition. They conclude:

> The schools visited differ in very many respects as institutions although each can demonstrate its quality in its aims, in oversight of pupils, in curriculum design, in standards of teaching and academic achievements and in its links with the local community. What they all have in common is effective leadership and a climate that is conducive to growth. The schools see themselves as places designed for learning: they take trouble to make their philosophy explicit for themselves and to explain them to parents and pupils; the foundation of their work and corporate life is an acceptance of shared values.

This seems to me to confuse values and standards. In evaluating a school one needs to agree what one is evaluating. What happens within a school will be determined by the

philosophical assumptions of the school, but within these assumptions by the quality of management of the school. It would be useless in a multi-ethnic area to draw to the attention of the local Imam the quality of educational dance in a school if all he can see is a group of immoral adolescents in provocative undress. To applaud the quality of design in a crafts department may be viewed by another observer as merely an excuse for poor craftsmanship.

To many this will be obvious. The problem is that it is almost impossible to define a meaningful set of educational objectives for an educational institution. Moreover, the exercise of defining objectives does not appear to lead to any modification of the activities of the institution. Either objectives are defined in terms of the activities already undertaken or they are defined in terms of the philosophical aims based upon what educators believe they 'ought' to be doing but are very different from what the individuals concerned actually are doing.

The difficulty of distinguishing between values and standards is well illustrated by another H.M.I. report (DES, 1978, p.20) where the need to clarify a[illegible]s and objectives is stressed:

> ...for unless the educational objectives of the school are first of all clarified, and detailed consideration is given to the nature of the task and to the form of organisation best suited for each separate subject or area of work, any form of grouping may tend to become an end in itself rather than a means. Since as previously noted, the social aims related to the mode of grouping were, in the schools visited, sometimes seen more clearly than the educational aims, this tendency may result in a lack of balance between the social and educational achievements of the school.

Popper (1945) argues the impossibility of distinguishing between means and ends. H.M.I., in the passage quoted, are saying that they consider pupil achievement in particular subjects more important than the social values that for which some schools are, presumably, prepared to sacrifice

subject achievement. No amount of definition of objectives will resolve this. Values are not determinable by rational argument. I may add that if you agree with Popper on the impossibility of distinguishing means and ends the whole structure of goals, aims and objectives collapses and the pseudo-rationality of a management by objectives approach disappears.

In their evaluation, Rutter (1979) and his co-workers used four measures:

examination success at 16;
disruption;
attendance;
and delinquency.

Of these, disruption is not readily accessible to evaluation by an Authority.

The common concept of 'a good school' includes the provision of various non-educational activities. Rutter found that participation in lunch-hour clubs, school and house sports, and after-school activities, did not relate to his measures of outcome at least in his sample of schools. The proportion of children who had contributed to a collection for charity correlated just significantly with attendance. Levels of sporting activity, the provision of opportunities for field trips and outdoor activities, participation in special projects and work for the community are all matters of record within a school, and it is possible for an authority to survey them. That they are not related to other measures is irrelevant. They are, subjectively, related to quality and they are measurable.

It is my experience on evidence admittedly subjective and anecdotal, that the assessment of schools, even among the professionals within an authority is often at the level of gossip. It can depend upon the quality of display in and near the entrance hall, the performance of the head teacher addressing teachers' courses, the reaction of Inspectors to the Head in the privacy of the Head's study and the quality of the annual school play. Now I do not suggest that the

impressions of experienced professionals are necessarily to be discounted; I do suggest that if they are not communicable in a rational manner they are unhelpful in generating a dialogue about the quality of work in a school.

It is possible for the task to be approached in a far more systematic way. The first step is to agree, with the school concerned, a set of values and criteria for judgement. These will be determined on the basis of experience but I would suggest that it should be possible to achieve a substantial element of common understanding. The criteria can be selected from those evolved by the profession over many years. Does the school have an effective statement of its philosophy? Is it reviewed with reasonable regularity? Does the statement relate well to what is actually done in the school? Do departments have statements which relate effectively to the overall school's statement? Are there effective mechanisms within the school to ensure that the work actually undertaken is in accordance with the statements? Are there regular department meetings? Is there regular monitoring of the work of the staff? Is there opportunity for departments to compare work with other departments? Are there mechanisms to encourage high expectations of the pupils? Are lessons well organised? Are they started and ended effectively? Is there evidence of friendly relationships between staff and pupils when they meet informally, casually in corridors and formally? Is there effective use of praise and reward? Is there overt response to pupils' need for warmth and affection? Is there distribution of responsibility for the care of the school and for decision making? Are there adequate opportunities for expression of views of individual members of staff? Is there effective use of tutorial periods? Does the school work well with parents? Is there school based youth work? Do the tutorial methods include the use of group work?

The evaluation must also include an evaluation of the standard of work and of behaviour in the school. Regular discussions between subject inspectors and school staff about the work of pupils accompanied by careful recording of the substance of

the discussion is required. Careful recording is needed, too, of the reactions of pupils and the general orderliness of the school.

The purpose of all this is to create a longitudinal view of the school established in a non-threatening manner on the basis of dialogue and written record available to the school. In the case of secondary schools, which are complex institutions, a number of professionals will in the course of routine visits contribute to the picture.

There remains the question of the nature of the standards implicit in the judgements being made. An Inspector appointed to an Authority will probably have served as a subject specialist in no more than three or four schools. The standards he internalises and applies to his judgements will, in fact, be those of his own teaching and in the main be those prevailing in the authority.

Even with the carefully structured system of external evaluation some more objective criteria are required. It is unlikely to be within the scope of the average authority to undertake surveys which meet the standards of academic rigour. On the other hand, it is possible with small effort to obtain sufficient information to test the subjective evaluations. The approximations needed are great and the assumptions tentative so that to use them in isolation would be dangerous; to rely entirely on subjective evaluations with no external tests would be equally so.

The data are not difficult to collect. School attendance data are readily available in most authorities. External examination results are also normally collected. There are problems in using external examination results, particularly in authorities with schools with sixth forms, in that a good deal of work is needed to distinguish between the minority taking external examinations at the end of the fourth year, the majority taking them at the end of the fifth year, and those who are repeating them or taking new subjects in the sixth form. 'A'-levels present fewer problems. Generally speaking, unless

it is known that the practice differs widely in the different schools it is probably reasonable to use the raw data as a first approximation. Data on police cautions and juvenile convictions are available from the Police Juvenile Bureaux.

There remains the question of an input criterion. In Manchester we have for some years administered a non-verbal reasoning test and tests in English and mathematics to all pupils in the second term of their first year in secondary school. We have found considerable stability in the results taken school by school. We have also found a remarkably high negative correlation (-0.95) between the results of the reading test (whether mean school score, proportion scoring over 110 or proportion scoring over 100) averaged over two years, and the proportion of pupils on roll taking free meals. This is, in fact, greater than the intercorrelations of the results of the different tests. You will gather that we undertake blanket testing. I see no point in an Authority using light sampling which produces no relevant management information. After a good deal of investigation undertaken quite separately we concluded that the proportion of children receiving free meals was a better measure of educational priority than any combination of factors we could arrive at and appears to be as good a proxy for an input criterion as any other that is obtainable. Indeed, it has the merit, by comparison with a measure based upon the performance of children in a test at the age of 11, of being related to the children actually in the school. In many of our schools there is a very substantial change in school population between the ages of 11 and 16.

The choice of a criterion for academic success is a matter of debate. Rutter used one based upon both 'O'-level equivalents and the lower grades of C.S.E. (Rutter, 1979). The I.L.E.A. (1979) in examining their 1976 results against the proportion of children in Band I at the age of eleven used proportions passing more than one and more than five 'O'-levels. We have used both these measures as well as the number of 'O'-level equivalents. The I.L.E.A. found that the number passing five or more 'O'-levels was more dependant upon the

proportion in Band I than the number passing one or more 'O'-levels (which would be expected). Intuitively, I prefer a simple count of the number of 'O'-level equivalents.

We obtain a strikingly different correlation between the academic criterion and the intake measures to that obtained by the I.L.E.A. The I.L.E.A. obtain a correlation co-efficient of nearly 0.9 for one or more 'O'-level passes and 0.94 for five or more passes. Our correlations are of the order of 0.65. Put another way, in the I.L.E.A. schools contribution of the input criterion varies from about 70% to about 90% depending upon the criterion. Ours is more of the order of 40%. On the other hand the equations of our regression lines are almost identical. The equation of a regression line is accessible even to the innumerate using a suitable electronic calculator. One can then obtain for each school a predicted number of examination passes per pupil, based upon the input criterion, with which to compare the actual number. This entails a very large assumption that all the variance not explained by the input criterion is explained by school-based practice. We know that the real position is much more complex than this.

The negative correlations we have found between pupils taking free meals and attendance are in the order of -0.85, and these are similar to the correlations found in Sheffield by Galloway (1976).

Do the rather gross assumptions made in these calculations matter? The answer lies in the way the calculations are used. Our experience in looking at our results is that in part they confirmed our perceptions but the tables contained a number of surprises. In practice, they illuminated points that we had overlooked.

The key question is: how do you use the evaluations? I see them as the basis for discussion with schools. Schools, like Authorities, internalise standards and expectations of children. There is little point in evaluation which is, on the one hand, kept secretly within an authority or, on the other hand, used punitively. The purpose must be, with our

schools, to explore ways in which the education of the children can be a little better next year than it has been this year.

A good school is a subjective concept. A subjective approach is more flexible and more sensitive than any set of coarse arithmetic measures. However, a subjective approach must be structured; it must be within a framework which will allow a systematic analysis illuminated by appropriate measurements, including measurements of important extra-curricular activities.

That brings me to my final point: What about the educational administrators in the education office? Presumably, depending upon the quality of the schools, examination success rates, delinquency and attendance rates vary between authorities partly because of differences in the pupils, but partly because of differences in the quality of the school system. Education Authorities, too, are susceptible to evaluation.

References

DES (1977), Ten Good Schools: A Secondary School Enquiry. HMSO.

DES (1978), Mixed Ability Work in Comprehensive Schools. HMSO.

Galloway, D. (1976), The British Journal of Educational Psychology, vol.46, pp.40-47.

ILEA (1979), School Examination Results in the ILEA. ILEA.

Popper, Karl (1945), The Open Society and its Enemies. 2 vols. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rutter, J. (1979), Fifteen Thousand Hours. Open Press.

BRITISH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SOCIETY

Honorary President: Professor G. Baron

Honorary Vice-President: Professor E.W.H. Briault

Council of Management, 1979-80

Chairman: Professor M.G. Hughes, Professor of Education (Social and Administrative Studies), University of Birmingham.

Vice-Chairman: A.R. Barnes, CBE, Headmaster, Ruffwood School, Kirkby.

Hon. Secretary: Dr E.A. Ewan, Head, Department of Educational Management and Administration, Moray House College of Education, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh.

Hon. Treasurer: R.P. Hornung, Secretary, Middlesex Polytechnic.

Dr R. Bolam, Research Fellow, School of Education, University of Bristol.

D.P.J. Browning, Chief Education Officer, Bedfordshire.

Dr T.R. Bone, Principal, Jordanhill College of Education, Glasgow.

J.L. Davies, Head, Department of Management in the Public Service, North East London Polytechnic.

Professor R. Glatter, Faculty of Educational Studies, The Open University.

M.W. Hewlett, Headmaster, Heart of England School, Solihull.

H.O. Jenkins, Principal Lecturer in Education Management, Department of Management Studies, The Polytechnic of Wales.

G.A.R. McHugh, Senior Research Officer, The Open University.

J.F. Mann, Secretary, The Open University.

D.L. Parkes, Head of Resources Group, Further Education Staff College, Blagdon, Bristol.

L.E. Watson, Head, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

R.M. ABBOT, *Education Officer, Ealing Education Department, Hadley House, 79/81 Uxbridge Road, Ealing, London, W5 5SU.*

J.J. ALCANTARA, *Education Officer, Department of Education, Gibraltar.*

M.E. ANGUS (Miss), *Assistant Education Officer, West Sussex County Council.*

P. BAILEY, *Senior Lecturer in Education, University of Leicester, 21 University Road, Leicester.*

A. BAKER, *Head of Manpower Studies Group, School of Management, University of Bath, Calverton Down, Bath.*

M. BANYARD, *Head of Humanities Department, City of Ely College, Cambridgeshire.*

A. BARNES, *Headmaster, Ruffwood School, Kirkby, Liverpool.*

Professor G. BARON, *Department of Educational Administration, University of London, Bedford Way, London.*

G.R. BARRELL, *Adviser in Educational Law to the College of Preceptors, 59 Wellfields, Loughton, Essex.*

J. BEDFORD, *Head of Department of Liberal Studies, Stafford College of Further Education, Earl Street, Stafford.*

C.H. BRECH, *Principal Lecturer in Accountancy, City of Birmingham Polytechnic, Birmingham.*

R.H. BIRD, *Under Secretary, Department of Education and Science, Elizabeth House, York Road, London.*

P.K. BODEN, *Senior Lecturer in Education, University of Keele, Keele.*

Dr R. BOLAM, *Research Fellow, School of Education, University of Bristol.*

Dr T.R. BONE, *Principal, Jordanhill College of Education, Glasgow.*

D.W. BOORMAN, *Academic Secretary, University College of Swansea, Swansea.*

M.P. BRUNT, *Assistant Education Officer, Walsall Metropolitan Council, Darwall Street, Walsall.*

J. CALVERT, *Lecturer in Management Science, Loughborough University of Technology, Loughborough, Leicestershire.*

Dr J.H. CAMPBELL, *Senior Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.*

W.P. CAPSTICK, *Head, Department of Business Management, Doncaster Metropolitan Institute of Higher Education, Doncaster.*

D.R. CARTER, *Senior Lecturer, Avery Hill College of Education, Bexley Road, London, SE9.*

R.E. CATLOW, *Deputy Headteacher, Breezehill School, Roxbury Avenue, Oldham.*

J.C. CLARK (Mrs), *Headmistress, Campions School, Stapleton Road, Borehamwood, Herts.*

D.B. CLARKE, *Vice-Principal, Redhill Technical College, Redhill, Surrey.*

D. CRACKNELL, *Research and Planning Officer, Education Department, Leeds.*

I.J. CRAIG, *Headmaster, West Hill Junior School, Dartford, Kent.*

G. CUNNINGHAM, Education Officer, Association of County Councils, Eaton House, 66A Eaton Square, Westminster.

T. DAVID, 'Education', 42 Great Portland Street, London, W1.

E. DAVIES (Mrs), Headteacher, St Anne's County First School, Surrey.

J.L. DAVIES, Anglian Regional Management Centre, Danbury Park, Chelmsford, Essex.

W.F. DENNISON, School of Education, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

C. DIMMOCK, Lecturer in Educational Administration, University College, Cardiff.

K. EBBUTT, Principal Lecturer in Science, Hounslow Borough College, Hounslow.

A.M. EJIOGU, Research Associate, University of Hull, Hull.

J. ELLIOTT-KEMP, Principal Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.

M.F. ELSOM, Head of RE Department, Chiswick School, Middlesex.

J.A. EMERSON, H.M. Inspector of Schools, The Council House, Solihull.

Dr E.A. EMAN, Head, Department of Educational Management and Administration, Moray House College of Education, Edinburgh.

D. FALCON, Senior Assistant Director of Education, Humberside Education Department, County Hall, Beverley.

K. FENNICK, Lecturer in Education, School of Education, Leeds University.

Dr F.B. FIDDLER, Lecturer in Education, Huddersfield Polytechnic, Huddersfield.

D.J.E. FIELD, Headmaster, Queensbridge School, Queensbridge Road, Moseley.

J. FIELDEN, Senior Manager, Peat, Marwick and Mitchell, 1 Puddle Dock, Blackfriars, London, EC4.

R. FINN, Lecturer, Mid Kent College of Higher and Further Education, Sittingbourne, Kent.

Sister GENEVIEVE, St Louise's Comprehensive College, Falls Road, Belfast.

H.A.J. GARNETT, Adviser (Non-Teaching Personnel), Knowsley Education Offices, Huyton Hey Road, Huyton.

J.A. GINNEVER, Professional Assistant, Department of Education, Leeds.

G. GLAISTER, Assistant Education Officer (FE), Oxfordshire County Council, Oxford.

Professor R. GLATTER, Faculty of Education, The Open University, Milton Keynes.

M.J. GLENN, Head, Corby Newham Secondary School, Cleveland.

J.H. GOLDSMITH, Duval High School, Armidale, NSW, Australia.

Dr A. GRADY, Dean of Education, Middlesex Polytechnic, Edmonton, London, N9.

J. GRANT-WOOD, Headmaster, Firrhill High School, Riffhill, Edinburgh.

Dr J. GREIG, Chelmer Institute of Higher Education, Chelmsford, Essex.

G. HACKER, Senior Lecturer in Educational Studies, Avery Hill College, Bexley Road, London, SE9.

D.J. HALE (Miss), Headmistress, Farringdon School, Sunderland, Tyne & Wear.

R.F. HALL, *Academic Registrar, Polytechnic of North London, Holloway Road, London, N7.*

C.W. HARVEY, *Secretary, School of Education, University of Bristol.*

J.E.A. HAVARD, *Director, Scottish Centre for Studies in School Administration, Moray House College of Education, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh.*

Dr R.H. HERBERT, *Senior Lecturer in Education Studies, Wolverhampton Polytechnic, Wolverhampton.*

M.W. HEWLETT, *Headmaster, Heart of England School, Solihull.*

D.C. HIGHAM, *Head of Upper School, Castle Vale School, Birmingham.*

T.M. HINDS, *Senior Education Officer, Berkshire Education Department, Reading, Berkshire.*

R. HOPKINS, *Senior Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.*

J. HORN (Mrs), *Administrative Assistant, Polytechnic of North London, London N7.*

R.P. HORNUNG, *Secretary, Middlesex Polytechnic, Bounds Green Road, London.*

Professor E. HOYLE, *School of Education, University of Bristol, Bristol.*

Professor M.G. HUGHES, *Head, Department of Social and Administrative Studies in Education, University of Birmingham.*

W.A. HUGHES, *Lecturer in Education Management, School of Education, Leeds Polytechnic, Leeds.*

G.A. JARRET (Mrs), *Second Mistress, Great Barr School, Aldridge Road, Great Barr, Birmingham.*

H.O. JENKINS, *Principal Lecturer in Education Management, Polytechnic of Wales, Cardiff.*

D.N. JUDSON, *Deputy Head, Washwood Heath School, Burney Lane, Birmingham.*

B.A.A. KNIGHT, *Headmaster, Holyrood School, Chard, Somerset.*

K. LAMBERT, *Headmaster, Great Barr County Secondary School, Aldridge Road, Birmingham.*

D. LANCASTER, *Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.*

J. LARKIN, *The Smithy, Tormorton, Badminton, Avon.*

R.P. LATHAM, *Senior Lecturer in Education Management, South Cheshire College, Crewe, Cheshire.*

J. LEWIS, *Deputy Head, Chapel-en-le-Frith Comprehensive School, Chapel-en-le-Frith, Derbyshire.*

J.M.A. LLOYD, *Senior Lecturer in Education, Suffolk College of Higher Education, Rope Walk, Ipswich.*

R. LONG, *Inspector of Schools, Inner London Education Authority, County Hall, London.*

D.G. LYNE, *Director, Bedford College of Higher Education, Lansdowne Road, Bedford.*

G. LYONS, *Principal Lecturer in Education Management, Anglian Regional Management Centre, Danbury, Chelmsford, Essex.*

Professor L.E. McCLEARY, School of Education, University of Utah, USA.

Professor I.D. McCLEARY, School of Education, University of Utah, USA.

B.J. McGETTRICK, Assistant Principal, Notre Dame College of Education, Glasgow.

G.A.R. McHUGH, Senior Research Fellow, The Open University, Milton Keynes.

E. McKEOWN, Principal Lecturer in Public Services Management, Centre for Management Education, Ulster Polytechnic, Newtonabbey, C. Antrim.

K. McWILLIAMS, Deputy Secretary, The Schools Council, 160 Great Portland Street, London, W1.

J. MALONE, Director, Schools Support Service, Queens University, Belfast.

Dr J.A. MANGAN, Senior Lecturer in Education, Jordanhill College of Education, Jordanhill, Glasgow.

L.C. MARTIN, Assistant Secretary, East Anglian Regional Advisory Council for Further Education.

P. MARTIN, Senior Lecturer, Department of Educational Development, Oxford Polytechnic, Oxford.

M.W. MATTHEWS, Deputy Head, Sir Leo Schultz High School, Hull.

A. MAUCHAN, Professional Administrative Assistant, Department of Education, Leeds.

R.H. MERCER, Principal Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.

P.H. MIDDLETON, Headmaster, Warwick Bolam High School, Neverton, Merseyside.

C. MORGAN, Faculty of Educational Studies, The Open University, Milton Keynes.

J.A. MUNDY (Miss), Principal Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.

E. MURDOCH (Miss), Headmistress, St Augustine's High School, Broomhouse Road, Edinburgh.

Dr G.O. MURRAY, Headmaster, Blakeston Comprehensive School, Stockton, Cleveland.

J.P. O'MAHONEY, Senior Lecturer, Harrow College of Higher Education, Harrow.

J.B. OLIVER, Deputy Head, Great Barr School, Birmingham.

D. PARKES, Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol.

R.S. PARKER, Lecturer in Education, Centre for Overseas Studies, University of Bristol School of Education, Bristol.

C. PARKIN, Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit, Department of Education and Science, Elizabeth House, York Road, London.

J. PAYNE, Inner London Education Authority Clerical Officer, County Hall, Westminster.

J. PERRY, Assistant Divisional Education Officer, Midlothian Division, Lothian Regional Council, Edinburgh.

J. PHILLIPS (Mrs), Headmistress, Brookvale School, Runcorn, Cheshire.

A. POLLOCK, Education Officer, 11 Deanhill Road, London, SW14.

S. PRATT, *Lecturer, School of Education, University of Bristol, Bristol.*

M. PREEDY, *Research Assistant, The Open University, Milton Keynes.*

C. PUGH, *Deputy Headmaster, Stockland Green School, Birmingham.*

S. RANSOM, *Institute of Local Government Studies, University of Birmingham, Birmingham.*

L.F. REASEY, *Senior Lecturer, Bulmershe College of Higher Education, Reading.*

P. RIBBINS, *Lecturer in Educational Administration, University of Birmingham, Birmingham.*

E. RICATTI (Miss), *Tintoretto No.8, 20145 Milano, Italy.*

C.R. RIDES, *Lecturer in Education Administration and Management, The Open University, Milton Keynes.*

A.T. RINGGUTH (Mrs), *Senior Administrative Assistant, Polytechnic of North London, Holloway Road, London.*

A.J. ROWLANDS, *Headmaster, Llandloes High School, Powys.*

T. SAMUEL (Ms), *Assistant Mistress, Rushmore Infants School, London, E5.*

J.E. SHAW (Miss), *Deputy Head, Hazel Grove High School, Jacksons Lane, Stockport.*

J.M. SHEPHERD, *Senior Assistant Education Officer, Education Department, Barnsley.*

P.[illegible] SIDAWAY, *Headmaster, St Aidans School, Lismore Place, Carlisle.*

T.J. SIMKINS, *Senior Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.*

P.W. SISSON, *In-Service Tutor, Bretton Hall College, West Bretton, nr Wakefield.*

N. SMALL, *39 Westwood Lane, Leeds 16.*

K.F. SMART, *School of Education, University of Reading, Reading.*

D. SMETHERHAM, *The Schools Council, 160 Great Portland Street, London.*

D.M. SMITH, *Lecturer, School of Education, University of Nottingham, Nottingham.*

Dr F. SMITH, *Research Fellow, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton.*

A. STANIFORTH (Miss), *Deputy Head, Ribston Hall High School, Gloucester.*

R. STEMMING, *Principal Lecturer, Anglian Regional Management Centre.*

R.J. STEPHENS, *Secretary and Clerk to the Court, Thames Polytechnic, Woolwich, London.*

M.A. STERNE, *Assistant Education Officer, Manchester Education Committee, Manchester.*

H. THOMAS, *Lecturer, Department of Social and Administrative Studies in Education, University of Birmingham, Birmingham.*

P.M. THOMPSON (Miss), *Headteacher, Turves Green Girls' School, Northfield, Birmingham.*

B.E. TINSON (Mrs), *Senior Lecturer, Department of Humanities, College of Art and Technology, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

H. TOMLINSON, *Headteacher, Birley High School, Hulme, Manchester.*

G.T. TONKIN, *Professional Assistant (Buildings and Development), Kirklees Education Department, Huddersfield.*

S.A. WALLINGTON, *Education Officer, London Borough of Haringay, London.*

G.E. WALSTER, *Department of Home Economics, Queen Margaret College, Edinburgh.*

D. WATSON, *130 Christchurch Road, Newport, Gwent (formerly Deputy Director of Education, Gwent).*

L.E. WATSON, *Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield.*

R.C. WEBB, *Staff Inspector, Welsh Office, H.M. Inspectors Section, Cardiff.*

M.E. WHITING, *Warden, Peterborough Annex, Kesteven College of Education, Peterborough.*

R.G. WHYMAN, *Deputy Headmaster, Immingham Comprehensive School, Immingham, Humberside.*

D.J. WILEY, *Head of Business Studies Department, Hartlepool College of Further Education, Hartlepool, Cleveland.*

Canon K. WILKES, *Diocesan Education Department, Bristol.*

G.L. WILLIAMS, *Senior Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield.*

R.O. WILLIAMS, *Principal Adviser, Lothian Region, Edinburgh.*

A.R. WILLIAMSON, *Deputy Principal, Keswick Hall College of Education, Norwich.*

R. WILSON, *Principal Lecturer in Education Management, North-East Wales Institute of Higher Education, Wrexham, Clwyd.*

G.A. WINTER, *Principal Lecturer, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic, Sheffield.*

D. WRIGHT, *Senior Lecturer in Education Management, Faculty of Education, Sunderland Polytechnic, Sunderland.*

P.E. YOUNG (Mrs), *Lecturer, Institute of Education, University of London.*